DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 446 UD 009 836

AUTHOR Kravetz, Nathan; Phillips, Edna M.
TITLE Special Primary Program in Five Schools. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City, 1968-69.
INSTITUTION Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.
REPORT NO CUE-P-0869; E007e
PUB DATE Oct 69
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.30
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement, After School Education, Compensatory Education, *Cultural Enrichment, *Early Childhood Education, Elementary Schools, Federal Programs, Parent Participation, Preschool Programs, Primary Grades, Reading Improvement, Reading Instruction, *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, New York City

ABSTRACT

Aimed at grades pre-K through 2 in five selected elementary schools, this program was to provide an overlay of staff and services in addition to those already provided by other poverty area school projects. Academic achievement, parental involvement, and better communication among the grades were the objectives. The emphasis was on reading and speech. After School Study Centers were set up to offer remedial and instructional reading, art, music, and crafts, and to serve as places for club meetings. The evaluation discusses actual implementation of provision of additional personnel and services, program's impact on children, effectiveness of staff, involvement and reactions of selected parents, and functioning and effectiveness of the After School Centers. Appendix includes measuring instruments, questionnaires, and interview and observation guides. Also appended is a discussion of a study of preschool program effects on child development. This study was based on teacher assessment of student skills, personal independence, language facility, and interpersonal relationships and motor ability. (KG)

ED038446

E007e

Project No. 0869

SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM IN FIVE SCHOOLS

by Nathan Kravetz
and Edna M. Phillips

October 1969

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1968-69

UD009836E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016

ED038446

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
ESEA Title I Program Evaluation

SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM IN FIVE SCHOOLS

Nathan Kravetz

and

Edna M. Phillips

UD009836E

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1968-69 school year.

October 1969

INTRODUCTION

The continuing study of disadvantaged children has resulted in an accumulation of evidence that their disadvantages lie not only in economic and social contexts, but substantially in the educational realm. Poor children, especially those in minority ethnic groups, tend to lag in academic achievement, a lag which is extended and increased through the years of schooling.

The search for solutions has reached into various areas and forms of educational innovation, but there is general agreement among all who are concerned with the problem of educational disadvantage that the focus must be on reaching the youngest child, on finding the optimum age for reaching him, and on determining the most useful procedures to insure his success throughout his school years.

In New York City's schools, a major effort has been underway in a "Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools." This program has been established in 285 elementary schools, constituting a target group of nearly 100,000 children in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2. With its major purpose the improvement of academic functioning of these children, the program stresses instruction in reading, and seeks to achieve academic improvement through the reduction of the teacher-pupil ratio and the provision of educational assistants in these grades.

It is this program for strengthening early childhood education in poverty area schools, seriously curtailed in 1968-1969, which served as a base and upon which the project: "Special Primary Programs in Five Schools" was established.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT	1
II	EVALUATION DESIGN	2
III	IMPLEMENTATION	5
IV	EVALUATION OF PROGRAM COMPONENTS	8
	A. Task Studies: Special Assignments	8
	B. Teacher Performance	19
	C. The After School Study Centers	24
	D. Teacher Perceptions of Special Primary Programs	29
	E. Parent Perceptions and Involvement	33
	F. Pupil Response	36
V	PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT	39

APPENDIX A CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY

APPENDIX B INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX C STAFF LIST

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Special Primary Program in Five Schools (SPP) was started in September 1967 and was then recycled in 1968-69. The major emphasis of the program was on grades pre-K through 2, although the program was also designed for the other grades through 6. The Special Primary Program for the five selected elementary schools provided an overlay of staff and services in addition to those already provided by the citywide Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools, and by any other ongoing programs in these five schools.

The Special Primary Program was aimed at raising the academic level of children, involving the parents in the program, and providing better communication and liaison among the grades in school. The program was intended to combine the main features of the More Effective Schools and the All Day Neighborhood Schools.

To achieve the stated goals, the program called for a reduction in in class size to 15 for K and grade 1, and to 20 for grade 2, through teachers supplied by the Early Childhood program. The Special Primary Program provided an additional increase in staff including teachers, grade coordinators, subject-matter specialists, and paraprofessionals from the communities where the schools are located. The plan also called for an increase in psychiatric, psychological, and guidance services.

A major feature of this program was the organization of After School Study Centers for reading (both a remedial and an instructional program), along with enrichment in art, music, crafts, and clubs. In addition, the project assigned a community relations coordinator to involve parents as partners in promoting academic achievement. Overall, the Special Primary Program called for heavy emphasis on reading, speech, and cultural enrichment.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION DESIGN

After consideration of the stated goals of the Special Primary Program, as presented in the project proposal, and after review of the procedures utilized in introducing the Program in the five schools, a design for evaluation of the program was formulated. The objectives of the evaluation design, and the procedures utilized, are summarized below:

1. Determination of the extent to which the program was implemented. This evaluation involved checking proposals for allocation of personnel and activities against actual field practice. In addition to checking official records to assess implementation, an interview guide was developed for use with principals. Other indications of program implementation were gathered from the interview guides used with teachers, parents, and selected pupils.

2. Determination of the program's effect on children. Several appraisal techniques were utilized: data were collected concerning the academic growth of those children who had participated in the program during its first (1967-1968) cycle, and who thus formed a continuing population available for testing. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (GMRT) were administered to all pupils in grades 1 and 2, and the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) were administered to all pupils in grades 2 and 3. Because these tests had also been used in the 1967-1968 cycle, a stable group of second-grade children could be identified who had taken the GMRT in the first grade, thus making an assessment of reading growth from grades 1 to 2 possible. Similarly, a third-grade group of stable pupils who had taken the MAT as second graders during the previous year was identified, and served as the subjects in a study of reading growth from grades 2 to 3.

In addition to these measures of pupil achievement, indications were sought of the children's participation in, and reactions to, the program. To this end, a pupil interview guide was prepared and used with selected pupils in grades 2 and 3.

On the kindergarten level, where standardized measures of pupil growth are not available, a nonstandardized questionnaire was prepared for use by teachers of kindergarten children to indicate the relative maturity of selected pupils. (A discussion of this appears in Appendix A.)

3. Determination of the effectiveness of staff performance. In this phase of the evaluation, the role of the added personnel (teachers, supervisors, grade coordinators, and other specialists) was studied. A task analysis form was prepared to help specify and define the activities of the additional personnel in the program. All individuals who

could be classified in this category were observed and interviewed. In the case of teachers, a questionnaire was developed to ascertain their views of the SPP and to obtain their suggestions for program improvement. In addition, an Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR), developed for observation of the More Effective Schools program,[1] was used to obtain information about the classroom functioning of teachers.

4. Determination of the involvement and reactions of selected parents. A parent interview guide was developed and used to obtain comments about the program, particularly with regard to parent and community involvement, and to the After School Study Centers. Information was obtained from two groups of parents: those employed in the schools as paraprofessionals, and those not so employed, but available for interview.

5. Determination of the functioning and effectiveness of the After School Study Centers. Assessment in this area included observation and interviews with supervisors, teachers, parents,and children. An observation guide, originally developed in the evaluation of the previous cycle of the program,[2] was used to obtain information about the centers and their operation. This information was supplemented by data gleaned from interviews with principals, parents, and pupils, and from teacher questionnaires.

(Copies of interview guides and questionnaires are included in Appendix B.)

Thus the approach to this problem has been to use as a base the academic achievement testing already done in the study of the previous 1967-68 cycle, and to determine growth of a stable population. In five schools, it was not difficult to select those pupils who had been in attendance and tested in the school in the spring of 1968, and who were still enrolled through the 1969 April MAT and May GMRT test periods. It seems reasonable to assume that program effects may be determined by assessing academic growth of the stable population in relation to a pretest, to a nonstable group, and to citywide results and test norms.

Table II-1 presents certain demographic aspects of the Five Special Primary Program schools.

---

[1] David J. Fox, Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program (New York: Center for Urban Education, September 1967).

[2] William O. Jenkins and Edna M. Phillips, Special Primary Programs in Five Schools (New York: Center for Urban Education, October 1968).

TABLE II-1

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS

School:	A	B	C	D[a]	E	Total
Enrollment May 1969						
Pre-K	59	59	60	0	30	208
K	197	170	145	81	95	688
1	248	172	162	110	99	791
2	245	161	158	94	96	754
Total	749	562	525	285	320	2441
Ethnicity Pre-K to 2 December 1968 (by Percent)						
Negro	62.2%	95.6%	81.1%	58.6%	96.8%	
Puerto Rican	34.6	4.4	17.2	29.7	1.0	
Other	3.1	0	1.7	11.7	2.3	
Total Enrollment	731	572	523	273	308	

[a] School D was in a neighborhood which was rapidly changing. However, it still retained some white middle-class population, as represented by the somewhat larger percentage of "others." Lack of classroom space made it impossible to establish a pre-K in that school.

CHAPTER III

IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of the project was determined through interviews with the principals of the five schools and with their assistants and colleagues.

Additional positions were allocated among the five schools based, essentially, on enrollment. The following additional positions, listed in Table III-1, were utilized for the day school program.

TABLE III-1

ADDITIONAL POSITIONS ALLOCATED AMONG THE FIVE SCHOOLS

School	A	B	C	D	E	Totals
Enrollment	749	562	525	285	320	2441
Ass't. Principal	1	1	1	1	0[a]	4
School Secretary	1	1	1	1	1	5
Teacher - Pre-K	2	2	2	0	1	7
Teacher - K	5	4	3	2	1	15
Teacher - Jr. Guidance	2[b]	2[b]	2	0	0	6
Tr. - Lang. Enrichment	2	1	1	1	1	6
Tr. - Speech Improvement	.5	.3	.3	.2	.2	1.5
Tr. - Grade 3 & 4 (Grade Coordinator)	2[b]	2[b]	1	1	1	7
Guidance Counselor	1.00	.75	.50	.50	.25	3
School Aides	5.00	3.2	2.6	2.6	2.6	16

[a] The AP position which should have been assigned to this school was given instead to the companion (upper primary) school connected with school A.

[b] Assigned to grades 3 and 4 in the tandem school.

It should be noted, that for lack of space, School D had no pre-K classes.

Teachers for citizenship and junior guidance were assigned only to Schools A and C, and, in School A they were placed in its companion school which has grades 3 - 6.

School E received no additional assistant principal under this program.

The project description for this year and the last stated, "guidance and psychological services will be stepped up considerably above the small base. The clinical team of which the psychiatrist will be a member will serve the children and their families."

Since in the previous cycle (1967-68) personnel for these services were generally not available, the budget this year included funds for one psychiatrist and no other associated psychological or social services. However, two principals reported that they had received school psychologist service and four reported receiving assistance from school social workers. One principal stated that a school psychiatrist had met with teachers and parents and had observed children in their classes.

The positions assigned for the After School Study Center for 86 sessions to be held from 3:00 to 5:00 P.M. are shown in Table III-2.

TABLE III-2

POSITIONS - AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTER

School	A	B	C	D	E
Principal	1	1	1	1	1
Teachers	6	13	13	13	13
School Secretary	1	1	1	1	1
School Aides	1.75	1.75	3	1.75	1.75

A major feature of the program was the overlay of services to the After School Study Centers. The number of positions added by the Special Primary Program, 13 to each school, was greater than the number of base positions already existing. The base positions, seven in each school, were district funded. All five principals reported that after receiving the added Special Primary personnel, the district authorities withdrew the seven base positions. Thus, while some of the Centers were operated with larger staffs than they had originally, they were not at the overlay level that would constitute the Special Primary Program.

Activities in the After School Centers included reading instruction (both basic and remedial) as well as a variety of enrichment programs. Although the intent of the program in maintaining the Centers was to provide the "all-day neighborhood school" aspect, attendance at the Centers generally involved only children in grade 2 and above. This will be discussed later in this report.

The implementation of the program "includes the reduction in class size to 15 for prekindergarten, kindergarten and grade 1, and to 20 for grade 2 as provided in the ... program to strengthen early childhood education."

Since the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education was curtailed during the 1968-69 cycle, and since the Special Primary Program existed within the first program, the registers were generally increased. Additional adults (paraprofessionals) were assigned to attempt to compensate for this with a resulting lower adult-pupil ratio. The program was generally implemented with respect to class size in the pre-K and kindergarten classes. In all schools, however, the range of enrollments in grade 1 was from 16 to 34, and in grade 2 from 15 to 32. In both grades, most classes included 25 to 29 pupils. The explanation of these aspects of program implementation will be discussed in a later section of this report.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM COMPONENTS

A. TASK STUDIES: SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS

In addition to a reduced teacher-pupil ratio in grades pre-K and K, and a reduced adult-pupil ratio in grades 1 and 2, the funding of the SPP provided for other personnel: to coordinate the program (assistant principal); to provide peer leadership (grade coordinator); to act as specialist in the areas of reading, new reading materials, and language arts (language enrichment teacher); to expedite the administration of the program (administrative assistant); and to act as liaison between community, families, and school (community relations teacher or community coordinator). A guidance counselor and a speech improvement teacher were added to increase services for maladjusted children.

Since there were no rigid requirements for each of the above categories in regard to special skills, experience, or license (except for assistant principal, guidance counselor, and teacher of speech improvement), nor any strict definitions concerning the functions of these positions, each principal selected the special personnel on the basis of his school's particular requirements. Those teachers selected from among the faculty had previous experience ranging from 4 to 25 years; the average was 11 years. The teachers so chosen were drawn from the essentially stable group in each school faculty. Those who were specially licensed were selected from eligibility lists, or were accepted by transfer into the school.

Except where specially licensed personnel were employed, the tasks designated for these positions varied considerably from school to school.

1. Tasks of Specially Licensed Personnel

The following paragraphs are intended to be both descriptive and evaluative. Several hours were spent with each teacher assigned to a special position in the SPP, interviewing the teacher, observing the activities in the office, the reports and materials handled, and the people who came in. While the activities, offices, and atmosphere were objectively noted, any other information was supplied by the teacher who was interviewed. From this we drew generalizations about the functions of the specialists.

a. Assistant principal (AP). The person in this position was part of the administration rather than one of the teaching staff. He had the duty of observing the teachers and in general of overseeing the activities in the grades under his supervision. The extra AP provided by the Special Primary Program performed these duties for the lower grades.

The overall supervision of lunchroom lines and the responsibility, sometimes delegated, of planning and arranging grade conferences were also tasks common to all APs. Where there was more than one AP, general school responsibilities were divided among them. These might include teacher training, review of curriculum materials, supervision of paraprofessionals, or some form of grade articulation. In the absence of any other authority, the AP generally assumed the burden of the overall discipline of the school.

As Table IV-1 shows, more of the time of most assistant principals was spent with teachers than with any other persons, and in the process of observation and supervision. A consistent task of the AP, though perhaps unrelated to the Special Primary Program, is that of lunchroom supervision.

b. Guidance Counselor. The main duties of the counselor were to work with children who did not fit into the major pattern of school standards or activity. Counselors were not supposed to handle children whose exclusive maladjustment lay in the area of poor discipline, but were expected to deal with the emotionally disturbed or the retarded who might also be troublesome, or with those who have severe learning inhibitions. The major part of their time was taken up with the guidance of individuals. (See Table IV-2.) Most of them also worked with groups and had many conferences with teachers about the problem children. They attempted to work and confer as well with the parents of such children. Some time was spent in preparing referrals for outside agencies. In one case a parent workshop was conducted.

c. Speech Improvement Teacher. Under the direct supervision of the Bureau of Speech Improvement, this teacher was expected to handle only those children who had physical rather than environmental or psychological speech defects, which but for the SPP would not officially be noted at so early an age. The teacher came twice weekly, and had an average group of 10 to 15, although it was usual to see not more than four or five in a class at any one time. She spent 90 percent of her time in teaching, and was allowed the additional time for parent conferences, agency contacts, etc. (See Table IV-3.) Two of the speech improvement teachers led parent discussions based on a weekly radio program concerned with speech problems. This was ordered by the Bureau when the school indicated its willingness to cooperate with this program. Another differentiated use of the time by one speech improvement teacher was with a special language arts group. Although they were licensed, most of these teachers had not had too much experience, the median being three years.

2. Tasks of Specialized Personnel Not Specially Licensed

All teachers in this category had licenses in Common Branches or Early Childhood, except for two paraprofessionals. Not all teachers in the comparable special positions engaged in the same activities. What they did depended on the interpretation of the assignment by each principal of an SPP school.

TABLE IV-1

TASK STUDIES - ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

SCHOOL CODE	LICENSE	YEARS EXPERIENCE INCLUDING OTHER LICENSES	REQUIRED ATTENDANCE AT OUTSIDE MEETINGS	NONSPECIALIZED DUTIES (*L.R. = LUNCHROOM)	SERVICE IN OTHER CAPACITIES	TASKS-PERCENTAGE OF TIME INVOLVED INCLUDES OVERALL COORD. OF SPP						
									MISCELLANEOUS			
						RATINGS AND OBSERVATIONS	OVERALL LUNCHROOM SUPERVISION	CONFERENCES AND CONFERENCE PLANNING	SCHEDULING	DISCIPLINE	SUPERVISION OF PARAPROFESSIONALS	UNCLASSIFIED
A	AP	16	None	L.R. Supervision	None	50	5	10	5	0	15	15
B	AP	11	None	L.R. Supervision	None	30	20	0	0	0	30	20
C	AP	18	None	L.R. Supervision	Grade Coordinator PK-K, in charge of school math program	50	10	30	0	0	0	10
D	AP	17	None	L.R. Supervision	Supervision of school music program	45	20	20	0	0	10	5
E	AP	20	None	General Factotum	Serves also as overall SPP co-ordinator	35	5	20	0	30	0	10

TABLE IV-2

TASK STUDIES - GUIDANCE COUNSELOR

SCHOOL CODE	LICENSE	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE INCLUDING TEACHING	OUTSIDE MEETINGS	NONSPECIALIZED DUTIES	SERVICE IN OTHER CAPACITIES	TASKS-PERCENTAGE OF TIME INVOLVED					
						INDIVIDUAL GUIDANCE	GROUP GUIDANCE	TEACHER CONFERENCES	PARENT CONFERENCES	AGENCY CONTACTS	MISCELLANEOUS
A	GC	15	District and Citywide	Parents' Reading Workshop	None	50	5	5	30	5	5
B	GC	12	District and Citywide	None	None	35	5	20	20	5	15
C	GC	10	District and Citywide	None	None	50	5	15	15	10	5
D	GC	10	District and Citywide	None	None	20	25	20	20	5	10
E	GC	14	District and Citywide	None	None	40	15	15	15	10	5

TABLE IV-3

TASK STUDIES - TEACHER-SPEECH IMPROVEMENT

SCHOOL CODE	LICENSE	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE INCLUDING OTHER LICENSES	REQUIRED ATTENDANCE AT OUTSIDE MEETINGS	NONSPECIALIZED DUTIES	SERVICE IN OTHER CAPACITIES	TASKS-PERCENTAGE OF TIME INVOLVED					
						THERAPY GROUPS	INDIVIDUAL TESTING AND TUTORING	PARENT CONFERENCES	PARENTS WORKSHOP	LANGUAGE ARTS GROUP	MISCELLANEOUS
A	Sp. Imp. (El.)	2	Bureau of Speech Improvement Once/Month	None	Parents' Workshop	90	3	2	5	0	0
B	Sp. Imp. (El.)	9	Bureau of Speech Improvement Once/Month	None	---	90	5	5	0	0	0
C	Sp. Imp. (El.)	2	Bureau of Speech Improvement Once/Month	None	Parents' Workshop	80	10	5	5	0	0
D	Sp. Imp. (El.)	4	Bureau of Speech Improvement Once/Month	None	---	80	5	10	0	0	5
E	Sp. Imp. (El.)	3	Bureau of Speech Improvement Once/Month	None	Parents' Workshop	50	5	5	5	30	5

a. Administrative Assistant (AA). This might be termed a super-clerical job with status. It was the AA's function to relieve the AP of many details in order to free him for his basic task of rating and supervision. Most AAs supervised the collection of money, arranged the scheduling of substitutes, or rescheduled preparation periods for teachers who have had to relinquish these periods for emergency coverage in the school. (See Table IV-4.) Some of them also took care of textbook requisitions, inventories, and in one report, school repairs. At least two of them were in charge of audiovisual aids, with a paraprofessional assistant who served as A-V aide. Several considered their special qualifications for this assignment to be previous secretarial experience.

b. Grade Coordinator. The function of the coordinator was "to lead and coordinate the instructional program in the grade."[1] Also the coordinator was to be a master teacher who could train the younger, more inexperienced teachers in the grade. Although the emphasis of the SPP was in early childhood, the coordinators were mandated for grades 3 and 4 in each school. In two schools the APs assumed the responsibility for coordination of the early grades. (See Table IV-5.) In one school the coordinator was also the language enrichment teacher, and in two schools the coordinator spent a substantial amount of time teaching reading. It would appear that while there were different teaching and coordinating tasks of grade coordinators in the five schools, their general function of help to teachers was poorly defined from the start. Included among the coordinator's tasks should be demonstrations of teaching and of use of materials, evaluation of pupil progress, and other services which enhance the teacher's ability to provide an appropriate curriculum.

c. Language Enrichment Teacher. In the project design the language enrichment teacher is described as a specialist. In the schools themselves, however, the job tasks were poorly interpreted and tended to overlap in some cases with the role of grade coordinator. The spectrum was wide: from an unfilled position to a full teaching position, to a half teaching position, to a combination of two assignments, to a full resource person.

The position was utilized fully in only one school. (See Table IV-6.) Here the language enrichment teacher used 30 percent of the time for demonstration lessons, suggested and prepared materials for the pupils as well as professional material for the teachers, thus serving as an informal teacher trainer as well as resource person. The office was always alive with teachers seeking and getting advice. There was an air of excitement and anticipation over the easy accessibility to new materials. In this school the language enrichment teachers (with the encouragement of the principal) were available to both faculty and pupils. But in general the nonteaching duties of the position are vaguely described and open to many interpretations.

---

[1] Project description, Special Primary Programs in Five Schools, November 1967, p 2.

TABLE IV-4

TASK STUDIES - ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

SCHOOL CODE	LICENSE CB = COMMON BRANCHES	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	REQUIRED ATTENDANCE AT OUTSIDE MEETINGS	NONSPECIALIZED DUTIES	SERVICE IN OTHER CAPACITIES	TASKS - PERCENTAGE OF TIME INVOLVED							
						FINANCES	BOOKS AND SUPPLIES	SCHEDULING	PREPARATION OF REPORTS	L.R. SUPERVISION	ADMINISTRATIVE CORRESPONDENCE	SUPERVISION OF A.V. AIDS AND AIDE	MISCELLANEOUS
A	CB	22	None	L.R. Duty	Occasional Class Coverage	25	25	30	10	10	0	0	0
B	CB	7	None	None	None	15	50	5	5	0	0	25	0
C	CB	4½	None	L.R. Duty	Occasional Class Coverage	30	10	10	0	0	0	40	10
D	CB	15	None	L.R. Duty	None	10	10	40	0	20	0	0	School Bulletin 20
E	CB	4	None	L.R. Duty	None	25	25	25	0	0	20	0	5

TABLE IV-5

TASK STUDIES - GRADE COORDINATOR (3rd and 4th)

						TASKS - PERCENTAGE OF TIME INVOLVED								
												MISCELLANEOUS		
SCHOOL CODE	LICENSE	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	REQUIRED ATTENDANCE AT OUTSIDE MEETINGS	NONSPECIALIZED DUTIES	SERVICE IN OTHER CAPACITIES	DEMONSTRATION LESSONS	ORIENTATION OF NEW TEACHERS	PLANNING AND PREPARATION OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS	TEACHING	TESTING	GRADE MEETINGS AND INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES	PARENT WORKSHOPS	AUDIOVISUAL SUPERVISION	UNCLASSIFIED
A	CB	7	None	L.R. Duty, Occasional Class Coverage	None	25	20	15	0	20	15	0	0	5
B	CB	16	None	None	Language Enrichment Teacher	25	0	50	0	20	0	0	0	5
C	CB	5	None	L.R. Duty, G.O. Supervisor	None	20	20	50	0	0	10	0	0	0
D	CB	13	District Meeting	L.R. Duty	A.V. Coordinator, E.A. Workshop, Reading Teacher	20	0	0	30	0	10	25	10	5
E	CB	8	None	None	Reading Teacher	0	5	0	90	5	0	0	0	0

TABLE IV-6

TASK STUDIES - TEACHER - LANGUAGE ENRICHMENT

SCHOOL CODE	LICENSE	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	REQUIRED ATTENDANCE AT OUTSIDE MEETINGS	NONSPECIALIZED DUTIES	SERVICE IN OTHER CAPACITIES	TASKS - PERCENTAGE OF TIME INVOLVED					
						DEMONSTRATION LESSONS	PREPARATION OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS	RESOURCE PERSON	INVOLVEMENT IN TESTING PROGRAM	TEACHING	MISCELLANEOUS
A	Early Child-hood	16	None	Early A.M. Duty; L.R. Duty	None	30	25	40	0	0	5
B	CB	14	None	None	Math Co-ordinator; Unofficial Coordinator for Grades 1 and 2	25	50	0	20	0	5
C	CB	--	--	EXCESSIVE TEACHER TURNOVER PRECLUDED CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONING IN THIS AREA.							
D	CB	6	None	L.R. Duty; Occasional Class Coverage	Teacher of Reading Improvement	20	0	5	10	50	15
E	CB	7	None	L.R. Duty	Teacher of Reading	100	0	0	0	0	0

d. **Community Relations Teacher.** This role was given the widest latitude of all. Although the design called for the position to be filled by a licensed teacher, it has been generally conceded that people from the neighborhood and intimately related to its problems could function better as liaison between the school and the community. License requirements in this case could constitute a barrier to logical or appropriate selection. In the two instances where the barrier was broken (by special permission) and community paraprofessionals were hired, the performance of the paraprofessionals justified the deviation from the rules.

The community relations coordinator was in a position to interpret the school to the parents and to the community (as represented in Community Action agencies, Model Cities Programs, and other local organizations) and to involve the parents in the activities of the school. Each of them was in touch with parents through individual conferences and by virtue of his required presence at Parent Teacher Association or Parent Association meetings. (See Table IV-7.) For some these contacts were perfunctory, and for others they generated the enthusiasm which made both parents and the larger community responsive. While in four of the five schools the importance of this coordinator's role was recognized, it should be noted that in school D the individual was assigned nearly one-half of the time to classroom teaching.

TABLE IV-7

TASK STUDIES - COMMUNITY COORDINATOR

SCHOOL CODE	LICENSE	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN LICENSED POSITION OR IN SCHOOL SERVICE AS PP	NONSPECIALIZED DUTIES	SERVICE IN OTHER CAPACITIES	REQUIRED ATTENDANCE AT OUTSIDE MEETINGS	TASKS - PERCENTAGE OF TIME INVOLVED						
						PARENT CONFERENCES & HOME VISITS	MEETINGS	LIAISON WITH P.A. OR P.T.A.	PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM	COMMUNITY AGENCIES	TEACHING	MISCELLANEOUS
A	P.P. (No License)	1	None	None	Community Council, P.T.A. Workshops	75	15	0	0	0	0	Translating 10
B	CB	25	None	None	P.T.A., (CORE, NAACP, Optional)	50	15	5	10	10	0	10
C	P.P. (No License)	5	None	None	Community Council, P.T.A., U.F.T. Liaison	50	15	10	10	10	0	5
D	CB	11	L.R. Duty	Reading Class, Music Class	P.T.A., P.T.A. Executive Board	15	5	5	0	5	40	L.R. Duty, Bulletin Boards for School 30
E	CB	10	L.R. Duty	None	Community Council, District Community Council, P.T.A.	10	10	0	60	0	0	L.R. Duty, Teachers' Seminar 20

Summary

Nowhere in the project proposal were the functions of special personnel specifically defined. Only twice during the year were the five principals called to a meeting to discuss the joint problems of SPP. As a result, no definitive outline of tasks was set down, and this is why the activities were so different from school to school.

In some cases even the general outline in the proposal seemed not to be followed. For example, a community coordinator who spent half the time teaching would not be completely fulfilling the expected role; nor would a language enrichment teacher not assigned to developing language enrichment; nor a grade coordinator whose main task was outside the various activities of coordinating. The general directive was blurred, except in cases where special licenses were required. It is recognized that principals should be permitted (a) flexibility in the assignment of teachers assigned to special duties (because of the desire to exploit the strengths of the teachers assigned to them); or (b) to modify somewhat the rigors of the assignment (in order to tailor its needs to those of the school situation).

The effects upon pupil achievement of the varying specialist tasks were probably peripheral and not consistent within any school. Thus we do not find positive relationships in this chapter or in Chapter V which follows between the functions of specialized personnel and the achievement of the stable pupil group.

B. TEACHER PERFORMANCE

1. Aspects of Teacher Functioning

As in the 1967-1968 study, the instrument used to measure aspects of teacher functioning in the SPP was a modification of the Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR), an instrument devised and employed by the MES evaluation team.

In this study we used the ILOR to investigate the possible effects of lower class registers on both the teaching and the learning process. Since there were no lower class registers in terms of teacher-pupil ratio, paraprofessionals were added to reduce the adult-pupil ratios. Keeping in mind this conceptual modification, the evaluation team looked for evidence of the teacher's planning, the amount of material covered, the quality and depth of instruction, and the adequate utilization of the smaller ratio. With respect to children's functioning as a reflection of teacher functioning, the team wanted to see how children responded in the classroom situation, whether they could raise spontaneous questions of their own which would show that they were developing a curiosity about the subject matter to which they were being exposed.

In each school two classes in each of the grades pre-K through 2 were observed, a total of 38 classes representing one-third of all the classes (33 percent) at these grade levels in each of the five SPP schools. (In addition, about 21 percent of grade 3 was seen, including classes in the two schools where the third grade was in the contiguous or tandem school.)

The design for the 1967-1968 SPP included lower registers: a ratio of 1-15 in grades K and 1, and 1-20 in grade 2. This proportion of teachers to pupils in grades 1 and 2 was planned for the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education (Strengthened Primary Program). In 1968-1969, however, the Strengthened Primary Program was modified: in 40 percent of the classes throughout the city the teacher-pupil ratio remained 1-15 in grade 1, and 1-20 in grade 2. In the remaining 60 percent of the classes there was a ratio of 1-27.5, or 25-29 to a class. In the five SPP schools, each a part of the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education, actual class registers were increased to an average of 25 in grade 1 and 26 in grade 2, with an educational assistant assigned to each class, thus reducing the adult-pupil ratio.

The observing team had complete freedom of choice as to which teacher and classroom were to be visited. Although all teachers were informed that they might be visited on a given day, they had no idea when during the day, or for what type of lesson, the team would come in. It may be assumed, therefore, that most lessons were typical of the best that the teacher had to offer, except where a teacher had been absent, or a class had been affected by circumstances outside the teacher's control, such as bad weather, epidemics causing excessive absence, etc.

At least 50 percent of the teachers were judged to be above average in presenting lessons which showed evidence of planning and organization, as well as quality. (See Table IV-8.) Half of the teachers were above average when it came to presenting a lesson in depth. In addition, the exercise of ingenuity and imagination on the part of the teachers was average and better. On the other hand, the use of varied teacher aids was poor. As for utilization of smaller registers, although there was in fact an increase in class size over 1967-1968, the adult-pupil ratio remained relatively low -- an average of 1-13 in grade 1, and 1-14 in grade 2. And while the aide did not take the place of another teacher, participation of the aide sometimes made it possible for the teacher to proceed at a normal pace instead of being hindered by the slow learner, who was taken in hand by the aide. More often the lesson was planned for the large, total class, and without considering the possibility of grouping into smaller units for instruction.

In the atmosphere of 1968-1969, with the teacher strikes and the struggle for community control creating conflict within many inner city schools, some teacher tension appears also to have been carried over into the classroom. (Four out of these five schools remained open during the strike.) The warmth of the relationship between the teacher and the pupil, and in some cases between the pupil and the teacher, seems to have been diminished. There was still a very large percentage of warm and giving and patient teachers (84 percent), but the 1967-1968 study showed a higher percentage (94 percent)[2] of such teaching style.

TABLE IV-8

RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF TEACHER FUNCTIONING
FOR FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS[a]
(N equals 38 classes)

Aspect	% Above Average	% Average	% Below Average
Quality of lesson	50	42	8
Amount of material covered	45	45	10
Depth of lesson	50	39	10
Planning and organization	52	26	21
Creativity and imagination	42	36	21
Use of teaching aids	18	39	40
Utilization of smaller registers[b]	31	21	42
Warmth of teacher-pupil relationship	63	21	15

[a] Where the percentages do not total to 100 percent it is because in some classes the rating of the particular aspect was not relevant.

[b] Since the classes in grades 1, 2, and 3 had registers of 25 or more, the problem of adapting to smaller class registers often seemed irrelevant. Thus the use of smaller adult-pupil ratios was evaluated.

Summary: Teacher Functioning

It is apparent that the quality of teaching as seen was generally above average, and that the major area for developing and improving teacher effectiveness lay in their use of teaching aids and in the utilization of smaller ratios. The SPP during the 1968-1969 cycle provided a lower adult-pupil ratio. The functioning of teachers in these circumstances was an aspect of program effectiveness.

---

[2] William O. Jenkins and Edna M. Phillips, Special Primary Program in Five Schools (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1968), p. 33.

The presence of average and above average qualities in general was reassuring as was the apparently small percentage of observed below average teacher activity. It seems to us that the need for improvement in terms of the use of teaching aids is associated with aspects both of creativity and imagination, and of planning and organization.

2. Aspects of Children's Classroom Functioning

Table IV-9 presents the ratings of children's classroom functioning which may be seen as a reflection of teaching function. Positive aspects of pupil functioning were seen in terms of participation (77 percent), interest (87 percent), and teacher-pupil relationships (81 percent). Also, there appeared to be a great number of pupils who were ready to learn. When teachers were questioned about this observation, many of them said that the "push to learn" was in the air this year, transmitted from community to parents to children, and reflected in the attitudes of most children in the classroom.

On the other hand, the passive attitude of the pupils was constantly evident: while the majority of the children showed great interest in what was going on (87 percent), only a little less than one-third (29 percent) volunteered in response to questions asked. This is a difference in learning style which appears to be strongly related to pupil concepts of what teachers expect of them. It appears to be corroborated in the teacher's general statement of approval of pupil readiness. Thus, pupils are seen favorably by their teachers when they "pay attention" rather than when they are listless and apathetic or when they are excessively outgoing in volunteering or initiating their participation in class.

In the lessons that were observed about 40 percent of the teachers made little or no attempt to relate subject matter to the background of the child, and in only 16 percent of the classes were the experiences of the children drawn upon with superior skill.

In a good many cases, where routine drill was going on, or where children were absorbed in following instructions for arts and crafts, attempts to draw upon pupil experiences or backgrounds would appear to be not so important. And not all lessons can be expected to surmount the boredom of the drill. A brief can be made for the comfortable routine of repetition: young children are more accepting of the known and the familiar, and teachers can spot weaknesses in learning. Drill or similar repetitious activities can provide fruitful learning experience for children when developed in meaningful and motivating circumstances.

TABLE IV-9

RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF CHILDREN'S CLASSROOM FUNCTIONING IN FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS[a]

(N equals 38 classes)

Aspect	% Above Average	% Average	% Below Average
Overall participation of children	77	16	7
Positive overall teacher-pupil relationship	81	8	10
Display of children's interest	87	10	3
Children's spontaneous questions	3	13	84
Volunteering in response to questions asked	29	8	27
Use of child's background	16	44	39

[a] Where the percentages do not total to 100, it is because in some classes the rating of the particular aspect was not relevant.

Summary: Children's Classroom Functioning

Pupils' learning styles may vary in terms of the nature of the learning to be accomplished, although pupils generally respond to teachers' expectations. We would stress that pupil classroom functioning depends both upon the specific learning task and the teacher expectations, and that teacher modes of presentation may vary widely in accomplishing educational goals. Just as the pupils' learning style may be affected by what the teachers expect of them, so the teaching style may be geared to what the teachers believe observers find unobjectionable.

C. THE AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

In the five Special Primary Schools the After School Study Center (ASSC) was intended to incorporate the concept of the All Day Neighborhood School for those pupils or their parents who desired it. The design included an extended school day from 3 P.M. to 5 P.M. three days a week, with an increase of the after school staff from seven to twenty positions. The local district supplied the seven positions, while SPP funds provided the extra thirteen for each school. However, during 1968-1969, local district authorities removed the seven basic positions from each school. As a result, while each SPP school had more positions than its neighboring school, no SPP school had what was originally intended for it, an overlay of thirteen positions. The average class register in ASSC was 18 (ranging from 15 in school E to 23 in School A). There were few or no aides or volunteers available to assist in the instruction of the ASSC classes.

Information about the ASSC was gathered in several ways: by interviews with the principals to ascertain organization plans, enrollments, teacher allotments; by interviews with ASSC teachers; and by direct observation of the classes. In addition, the parent and pupil interviews and teacher questionnaires yielded some data about reactions to the ASSC.

1. Reports by Principals

The principals, all of whom were completely in support of the aims of the ASSC, were unhappy about the curtailment of personnel. It meant that there would be an increase in pupil-teacher ratio with the resulting proportionate loss of individual contacts which they had seen to be so valuable in the previous year's program. But one effect of the reduction of the ASSC staff was that the larger classes made it feasible to group most classes according to grade. Such grouping was effected in four of the five schools, and the resulting greater homogeneity among the pupils brought about more structured, though still largely informal, teaching. Professional personnel were generally in favor of this arrangement.

Except in one school, no adequate mechanism had been devised to integrate the ASSC with the day school through teacher conferences or written reports so that one teacher could reinforce the other for the greater good of the child. This was recognized by the principals as a situation in need of correction. The chaos of the school year, and the fact that the ASSC did not get started until well after the term had begun, gave the principals other priorities. Most of them agreed that the problem of articulation would be tackled the following year.

2. Observations of Classroom Teaching (ASSC)

Visits were made to 28 percent of all ASSC classes (16 out of 58). Of those classes 69 percent consisted of pupils in the primary grades (1 and 2), since the object of the SPP evaluation was to concentrate on the primary level. Pupils below grade 1 were thought to be too young to attend the after school session. The remaining pupils came from grades 3 to 6.

The observations revealed that over half of the teachers (62 percent) were focusing on more formal curriculum content through structured groups and individual tutoring: that is, there was a pointed attempt to raise subject achievement levels, and there were more serious efforts on the part of the teachers to compensate for shortages in materials. (See Table IV-10.) Yet the classrooms by and large remained informal in spirit, so that the teachers were able to take advantage of the small registers. In line with this, too long a time was usually occupied with the consumption of refreshments between the day and the ASSC session. If we keep in mind that for the teachers, too, the ASSC represented an extended (salaried) school day, we must also note that about two-thirds of them (63 percent) undertook their tasks with warmth, enthusiasm, and competence.

3. Teacher Perceptions of Pupils (ASSC)

About 25 percent of the pupils in three schools, and 14 percent in two schools, were registered in the ASSC. In one lower primary school all the pupils came from grade 1 and 2. In the other schools the percentage of pupils from grades 1 and 2 ranged from 17 percent to 48 percent. The attendance on an average day went from 40 percent to 58 percent in the five schools. Table IV-11 shows ASSC registration and attendance.

The atmosphere in the After School Study Center seemed to the observers to be purposive and serious. Teachers reported that those pupils who were registered tended to appear regularly, and if one can accept the reliability of pupil response, most of the pupils (55 percent) said that they enjoyed the formal learning periods more than the game periods, that is, they preferred structured learning to "playing."

Of the ASSC teachers who were interviewed (there was one interview in depth in each of the five schools), at least three of them attributed the shift in pupil attitude to the current cultural geist: the students were really putting a greater effort into their studies because both parents and community were adding more support and expecting more of them. About 70 percent of the teachers reported an advance in reading interests and peer relationships. (See Table IV-12.)

TABLE IV-10

ASSESMENT OF TEACHERS IN ASSC IN ALL FIVE SPP SCHOOLS (N = 28% of all classes in ASSC)

N Equals 16 Classes[a]		% of Classes
Activities carried out	in the form of games or projects	25
	through tutoring	31
	through formal lessons	31
	through clubs	13
Availability of materials different from those in day school	yes	38
	no	44
	not always	19
Ingenuity of teacher in face of shortages	yes	56
	no	44
Coverage of subject matter: did it warrant extra time spent?	yes	56
	no	13
	not observable	31
Adaptation to smaller register	effective	56
	in many or most instances	31
	none	6
Capability and attitude of teacher	enthusiasm, warmth, competence	63
	competence	31
	ineptness	6

[a] In 69 percent (11 out of 16) of these classes the pupils were either entirely or predominantly from grade 2 or below.

TABLE IV-11

ASSC REGISTER AND ATTENDANCE

School	School Register	ASSC Register % of Total Register	ASSC Pupils From Grades PK - 2 % of ASSC Register	Single Day's Attendance % of Register[a]
A[b]	790	14	100	40
B[c]	1263	14	17	58
C	1050	23	19	42
D	785	25	26	53
E	565	27	48	49

[a] These figures were arrived at by comparing the register and the attendance on the day the team observed, and assuming that it was an average day.

[b] This school, a lower primary school, has only six instead of thirteen faculty members in the ASSC, the rest being allotted to its sister (tandem) school which is an upper level school.

[c] This register represents the combined population of the upper and lower (tandem) school, since only one after school center was used for both.

TABLE IV-12

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING THOSE PUPILS WHO ATTEND ASSC

	Percentage of Teacher Responses		
N = 30	Positive	Negative	No Comment
Has there been an increased interest in reading and related activities in half or more than half of the pupils?	70	3	27
Has there been evidence of improved relationship among their peers in half or more than half of the pupils?	73	13	13
Have half or more than half of these pupils improved in their relationship with their teachers?	73	14	13

Of the 75 day school teachers who had been in the program the year before, 30 (40 percent) responded to the questionnaire about the effect of the ASSC on those of their pupils who attended.

As noted, teachers when interviewed and on questionnaires felt they had observed improvements in those of their pupils who attended the ASSC. While the indications were in terms of attitudes and interests, some general statements were offered which tended to relate greater motivation in such pupils toward their academic work.

While changes in motivation may be related to maturation, parental influence, class success, and other causes, the teachers who responded to the questionnaire saw attendance at the ASSC also as one of the contributing causes.

There were other positive comments about the ASSC which are worthy of note. Teachers said: Children who attend the ASSC are more ready to get to work in the day school; there is less frustration because of the improvement of reading skills, and therefore the day school is more enjoyable for many pupils; there is a greater interest on the part of parents whose children attend the ASSC.

This is not to conclude that the achievement level of the pupils involved was raised. Such a determination was impracticable to make for this population. For except in one school there was, as has been said, no adequate articulation with the day school. Two schools issued "report cards" to the parents at the end of the term; another made notations of attendance at ASSC on the child's record; one school made no attempt at articulation. Only one school created a more or less formal exchange between the day school teacher and the after school teacher, so that progress, if any, could be noted and directed.

4. Parent and Pupil Perceptions of ASSC

Of the parents who were interviewed, about half thought the program worthwhile, and offered either constructive suggestions or none because they thought the program was good as it was. A majority offered no comment, and there were practically no negative statements. Many offered suggestions for improvement, although, except for the request for more aides, there was no consensus expressed. Those who expressed approval were uncritical.

Of the pupils who indicated what they liked best about the ASSC (only one-third answered this question), more than half said they liked the learning periods better than the game or recreation periods. This response may have been recorded because children have a tendency to tell adults what they think they want to hear, or because, as was suggested by many teachers, the pressure from home and community emphasized learning, or because the children really felt that way.

Summary

In spite of the reduction of the faculty in ASSC and the consequent slight increase in class register, the majority of teachers, parents, and pupils who were involved in the program were favorably disposed. There were still some snags: both teachers and pupils were tired at the end of the day and classes were slow in starting; the snack period also seemed to consume too much time; there were not enough materials in use which are different from those in the day schools. And school personnel have yet to devise a way of measuring accomplishment in the ASSC. Until this is done it is difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate objectively the effects of the ASSC upon school achievement.

D. TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM

Since the program was now in its second year, and the teachers were aware of the increased services offered to the lower grades, those who had previously been associated with the SPP were asked about their reactions to it. Questionnaires (Appendix B) were distributed to all the teachers now in the school who had worked in the program in grades Pre-K through 3 during the previous year -- a total of 82, of whom 75, or 91 percent, responded. Since the total faculty in grades Pre-K through 3 in all five SPP schools numbered 125, the questionnaire was distributed to about 60 percent of the faculty.

The questions were divided into two parts, the first part dealing with the ASSC and its possible effect on both the achievement and the attitudinal changes of the pupils. This was discussed in section C of this chapter. The second part dealt more specifically with the effectiveness of the teachers: whether small teaching units had helped the teaching process, how the teacher reacted to an additional adult paraprofessional in the classroom, whether it was possible to create new teaching techniques for these new situations, and what kind of further teacher training was needed.

The average teaching experience was higher than that of the previous year, because just as a stable population was sorted out for the pupils, so the teachers by the very nature of the selection constituted a more stable population by an additional year. The range was from 1.5 to 32 years, with a mean teaching experience of 4.6 years. Most of the teachers (71 percent) however, had less than 5 years of experience.

1. Response to Teachers' Needs

In the second part of the questionnaire teachers were asked how they felt about small groups and how to handle them, about the presence of another adult in the classroom, and about the areas in which they felt they needed further training. Although the class registers were larger than those of the previous year (since in these five SPP schools the second teacher had been removed), it was still possible for the teacher to work with small groups because of the presence of a paraprofessional for five hours of the day. Table IV-13 shows that a majority of teachers (76 percent) said they had been able to develop new techniques for the handling of their classes in small groups. When these were described, however, they turned out to represent arguments in favor of small groups rather than techniques for handling them. The use of paraprofessionals in the classroom, rather than the presence of another teacher, received wide acceptance among the teachers. Under these circumstances authority could be delegated but need not necessarily be shared by co-equal professionals. Nevertheless 22 percent mentioned paraprofessionals as "new techniques." An additional 22 percent referred to the handling of smaller groups and individualized instruction (as a result of the presence of the paraprofessional) as a new technique. Thus nearly half the teachers placed strong emphasis upon the paraprofessional as a positive teaching factor. Only 16 percent of these teachers cited specific materials or methods as new techniques, such as motor control exercises, games used as a review device, mimeographed books, or increased audiovisual aids in the form of miniature chalk boards, slides, or tape recorders.

TABLE IV-13

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FUNCTIONING OF THE SPP (N = 75)

	Percentage of Teacher Responses		
	Positive	Negative	No Comment
Is the presence of another adult in your classroom a hindrance?	16	67	16
Would you rather conduct a class of 15 or 20 by yourself?	53	33	13
Have you been able to find new techniques this year for handling your class in small groups?	76	12	12
Yes, new techniques are "paraprofessional."	22		
Yes, new techniques are "smaller groups."	22		
Yes, new techniques are "new methods and materials."	16		
Yes, no description offered	16		
Would you welcome further training in the teaching of the disadvantaged?	77	22	
Has there in your opinion been greater parent involvement and interest in the children's progress this year?	68	24	7
Do you have any general comments or suggestions to make about the SPP?	48	5	47

Only 16 percent of the teachers expressed negative feelings about the presence of another adult in the classroom, while two-thirds, or 67 percent were enthusiastically for it.

Yet, to the question, "Would you rather conduct a class of 15 or 20 by yourself (instead of a class of 25 or 30 with an educational assistant)?" over half (53 percent) responded positively. In the

1967-1968 report,[3] 86 percent of the teachers said that they would rather teach a class of 15 by themselves than share a class of 30 with another teacher in spite of the flexibility the two-teacher classroom afforded. Since this year so many fewer teachers responded positively to a similar idea, it might be concluded that while the presence of another adult has its advantages, the presence of a fellow teacher, with whom one must reach decisions and share authority, may present many additional problems.

It is a measure perhaps of the greater confidence of the teachers that fewer of them (77 percent) expressed the desire for further training in the teaching of the disadvantaged than those in last year's sample (94 percent).[4] None of these teachers was absolutely new to the teaching experience; each had had at least one and one-half years of work in an inner city school, and each had worked with small groups within their classrooms the previous year. Still, a good majority did feel the need to improve their skills. Their requests for training were in the fields of subject matter, such as methods of teaching math, science, or reading; classroom management, such as techniques for handling small groups and working with assistants; and understanding the nonconforming or emotionally disturbed child. Many of these needs could be met within their own school organization. Suggestions for more teacher workshops, more demonstration lessons, closer cooperation with a group leader (grade coordinator), and inservice courses in the psychology of the disadvantaged child were made by two-thirds of the teachers.

2. Teacher Comments About the SPP

There were very few negative reactions (5 percent) to the SPP. Those who were negative about it said that classes were too large to be considered as an experiment, and that there were not enough differences in procedure between these SPP classes and any other classes. Those who were positive about it (48 percent) pointed to the existence of educational assistants which made working with small groups possible; the extension of the school day for those who wanted it (ASSC); the greatly reduced adult-pupil ratio in the pre-K and K grades -- coupled with their slightly lengthened school day --; and the formal reading program in those grades. About half (47 percent) made no comment about program.

Among the many constructive suggestions which were made, those which occurred with greatest frequency concerned the need for a more efficacious distribution of funds to use for trips and for educational materials, the goal of still smaller classes in spite of the help presently afforded by the paraprofessionals, and, as has been previously stated, more particularized teacher training in each school.

---

[3] Jenkins and Phillips, p 30.

[4] Ibid.

Summary

About half the teachers showed positive approval of the Special Primary Program. The slightly lengthened school day for pre-K and K pupils opened the door to a meaningful reading program and a lunch program which helped the socializing process. The presence of the educational assistant proved valuable to a majority of the teachers, expanding their opportunities to individualize instruction by working with small groups. They tended to think of the educational assistant herself as a new technique; only a few referred to other devices such as audiovisual aids or new materials. But the majority still would have preferred to have smaller classes which they could handle alone. And to this end the teachers would welcome further on-the-job training in the teaching of the disadvantaged.

E. PARENT PERCEPTIONS AND INVOLVEMENT

According to the principals and those of their staff who dealt with the parents, it remained difficult to activate parents as a group to cope with relevant community problems such as zoning and housing for example, or even with schoolwide problems which did not immediately touch their own children. Parents responded directly to the needs of their children and usually not to the broader social requirements of the community or of the school. In only one instance was one of the five schools able to reach out, albeit feebly, into the community through the school-community coordinator, who in this case was a paraprofessional from the community rather than a teacher. This worker made numerous home visits, helped parents with problems of housing and welfare, and as a result they attended social events and some meetings where the barrier between teacher and community was weakened if not broken down. In other words, the parents in this instance had accepted the leadership of a community worker who was able to bridge the gap because she happened to be based in the school, and was a member of the community.

In order to find out in what way parents were involved with the school's program, how they perceived the school and their own children in relation to it, a select group of 80 parents (about 15 or 16 from each school) was interviewed. (See Appendix B.) They were selected on the basis of their availability for interview, because they were employed by the school, had come to a workshop or meeting, or had come in to confer with a member of the faculty. These were concerned parents. They were not therefore necessarily representative of the parent body as a whole.

The questions were centered around the parent's perception of the child's progress, the role of the parent in establishing proper working conditions for the child at home, the role of the parent as teacher, and the extent to which parent and teacher were able to work together for the benefit of the child.

Of the 80 parents who were interviewed, almost all, or 93 percent, had children who were at present attending the school, and over one-third (37 percent) had children who also attended the ASSC (Table IV-14). Almost half the parents had attended a workshop at one time or another. Of the parents interviewed, about two-thirds (64 percent) were employed by the schools. These parents had been associated with their schools in volunteer capacities earlier.

A little more than half of the paraprofessionals (55 percent) and a little less than half of the others (48 percent) indicated that they were in very frequent contact with the principal or teacher -- on an average of once a week. The difference between the two groups, while not great, might be explained in terms of the greater opportunity that the school-based group had to avail themselves of faculty advice.

1. Parents' Perceptions of Their Children's Progress

Fifty-eight percent of the parents reported that their children read more at home this year than last. In addition, 78 percent of the parents reported that their children used the school or class library, and 50 percent also reported that their children made use of the public library. While the conception of good study skills originated in the classroom, most of the parents accounted for some of the perceived progress by stating that they regularly checked the child's homework (74 percent) and that they provided a regular time and place in which to do it (69 percent). Only a little more than half (56 percent), however, said they were able to help the child with his homework. Nevertheless, three-fourths (76 percent) of the parents thought they ought to be asked to help teach their child. Only 28 percent felt that the teaching of subject matter such as reading and arithmetic should be left entirely to the teacher.

2. Parent Involvement in Workshops

Parent workshops were conducted in all five SPP schools, some with the aim of helping the parents to help themselves (workshops in sewing, in "alphabet" for the non-English speaking, etc.), and some with the goal of helping parents to help their children (workshops in reading problems and in understanding the new math). The latter child-centered workshops were attended by about one-third of those parents who registered for workshops. While leaders reported that attendance at workshops had improved over the previous year, it was still erratic and the workshop leader could not depend on continuity. The tendency at present is to organize several one-session workshops which would not involve continuity.

TABLE IV-14

PARENT INVENTORY (N = 80)

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No Comment
About the parent			
Are you employed by the school in any capacity?	64	36	--
Have you volunteered your services to the school at one time or another?	40	46	14
Do you have children in school at the present time?	93	7	0
Is your child in grade 3 or below?	75	25	0
Does your child attend the ASSC?	37	53	10
Is your child who attends the ASSC in grade 3 or below?	20	80	--
Do you feel that his attendance here has helped his daytime studies?	31	14	56
Have you been in touch with your child's teacher or principal frequently (once a week or more often)?	39	51	10
Paraprofessional - 55 percent			
Other Parents - 48 percent			
Do you attend or have you attended a parents' workshop?	48	46	6
About the child			
Does your child read more at home this year than last?	58	9	33
Does he take books home from the school or class library?	78	5	17
From the public library?	50	28	22
Do you check your child's homework?	74	8	18
Do you provide a regular time and place for him to do his homework?	69	9	22
Do you think he is given an adequate amount of homework?	60	18	22
Have you been able to help him with his homework?	79	5	16
About parents' opinions			
Do you think it proper for a parent to be asked to help to teach his child?	76	11	13
Do you think all teaching (of reading, writing, arithmetic, etc) should be completely left to the teacher?	28	35	37
Do you have any suggestions which you think might improve the running of ASSC?	23	26	51
Do you have any suggestions which you think might improve the school's program in the lower grades, pre-kindergarten through grade 3?	28	46	26

3. Parents' Suggestions for Improvement

Among the suggestions for the improvement of the program were an increase in ASSC personnel (more math and reading tutors; more aides), a more equitable distribution of afternoon refreshments (sometimes there were not enough to go around), and a wider educational campaign to familiarize parents with the ASSC. Even many of these selected parents said they had no knowledge of this aspect of the project.

Suggestions for the improvement of the lower school emphasized the need for devising better methods of maintaining discipline, and for greater parent participation. There were also some scattered requests for improvement of the new math curriculum and for enriched programs for the more advanced child.

Summary

Principals and staff stated that involving parents as a group remained a difficult problem, since parents tended to respond more positively to situations concerning their own children. Parents generally attended meetings only when problems concerning their own children were under discussion. One of the two paraprofessional community coordinators was able somewhat to counteract the apparent apathy of the nonactive parents by gaining their confidence within the community.

The parents interviewed in this sample tended to represent the highest level of participation within each school. Those who were employed by the school made up the volunteer group. Those whose children attended the ASSC and were able to respond to feelings about the SPP, of which the ASSC is part, were by and large favorable to it.

Too little is known about the "other" parents. The "concerned" parents who were interviewed attended workshops, volunteered their services, visited faculty members frequently, and stated that they provided supervision for their children's home assignments. The suggestions for improvement offered by them included methods of maintaining discipline, a better way of presenting the new math curriculum, and enriched programs for the more advanced child.

Other suggestions included an increase of personnel for the ASSC, and an educational campaign to make parents aware of the extra services their school offered.

F. PUPIL RESPONSE

One hundred pupils from the five SPP schools were interviewed. They were selected from grades 2 and 3 and ranged in age from 7 to 9 years. It was thought that the six-year-olds in grade 1 were too young to be questioned. Ten (an equal number of boys and girls) were chosen at random from each of these grades in the school. While the reliability of response cannot be completely depended upon in children of this age, it was hoped that some answers would be given which would corroborate or support information obtained from other sources. Pupil comments might also tend to indicate a general trend of responses to school activities and programs.

Of the one-third who attended the ASSC (33 percent), half of the pupils said they preferred academic subjects such as math or reading to games or nonacademic subjects such as sewing or crafts. (See Table IV-15) Only about one-third preferred the latter activities. In other words, the pupils seemed to favor the pursuit of learning over the pursuit of recreation. The teachers who staffed the ASSC corroborated these comments of the student.

Concerning the day school, the majority (89 percent) liked it somewhat or very much, again giving as the reason that they enjoyed learning (63 percent). Only 11 percent of the pupils liked it not too well or not at all.

With regard to their own abilities in reading, most of the pupils interviewed (86 percent) said they were "fair" or "very good" readers. The remainder (15 percent) were more modest, calling themselves "not good" readers. A majority of the pupils (75 percent) also thought of themselves as better readers than they had been during the previous year. They used the class or school library regularly (86 percent), they said, and half of them also used the public library (52 percent). In addition, 76 percent reported that someone at home helped with homework, a parent (59 percent), a sibling (36 percent), or other helper (5 percent). These statements are similar to those made by many of the parents who had been interviewed.

While limited acceptance is usually given to the responses of so young a group of children, their comments and reactions complemented those of the teachers and the parents who were similarly questioned and whose responses were similar.

There is, in essence, evidence of a general academic interest on the part of children and their parents in these SPP schools. Both groups state their actual adherence to the "best" precepts with regard to use of leisure time, to a suitable environment for homework, to parental supervision of homework, and to an increasing interest in books and reading. The relationship here indicated tentatively between acknowledgement of school-inspired values and standardized achievement scores has yet to be determined.

TABLE IV-15

PUPILS' RESPONSES (N = 100)

	Percentage of Response	
Responses Involving Reading	Positive	Negative
Do you like school?	89	
Very much	78	
All right	11	
Not too much or not at all		11
What is your favorite subject?		
Reading	43	
Math	31	
Others	25	
Do you attend the ASSC?	33	67
What subjects in the ASSC do you like best?		
Reading	21	
Math	30	
Sewing, Crafts, Games	33	
Homework	15	
Does someone at home help you with your homework?	76	
Yes. A parent	59	
Yes. A sibling	36	
Yes. Someone else	5	
Do you borrow books from the class or school library?	86	14
Do you borrow books from the public library?	52	48
Do you think you are a better reader than you were last year?		
Better	75	
Same	22	
Worse		3
What kind of reader do you think you are?		
Very good	54	
Fair	32	
Not good		15

CHAPTER V

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

A. STANDARDIZED READING TESTS

A basic objective of the Special Primary Program in the five schools was to improve the academic achievement of the pupils. The addition of teachers, special coordinators, supervisors, and paraprofessionals intended that teacher-pupil contacts would result in more effective teaching-learning.

Further, the original "overlay" of staff for After School Study Centers in the Special Primary Program was planned to provide additional remedial opportunities as well as enrichment experiences for the children of these schools.

Given the variety of new and added aids to learning, the achievement of academic growth as a goal called for objective verification in addition to anecdotal reports, subjective comments, or enthusiasm based upon the concrete fact of involvement.

Thus, use was made of standardized testing procedures which may indicate concretely the growth in reading achievement, a major objective of the program.

Evaluation of the previous year's cycle was handicapped to a great extent by the absence of two important elements: (1) a pretest and posttest situation, and (2) a population recognized as stable whose continued enrollment in a school represents experience in the program being studied.

It is generally recognized that the two elements are mutually dependent; i.e., with the stable population available the pretest administered to this group with a posttest follow-up can provide reliable data for study. Obviously, a pretest administered to a random group followed by a posttest of a different random group yields little useful evidence.

Thus, for this study, the stable population could be identified. Since the program was (in July 1969) at the end of its second year of operation, and since it was focused upon the primary grades, longitudinal test data were limited. However, in the 1967-68 program, the first and second grades were administered the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (GMRT). Also, the regular spring citywide testing program administered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading (MAT) to second grades and above.

For this study, therefore, it was decided to locate those pupils in each school who were in third grade and who had been enrolled and tested in the second grade in the Spring of 1968. We also located those pupils in the second grade who had been enrolled and tested (GMRT) in the first grade.

Finally, we collected the names of pupils in first grade who had been enrolled in kindergarten in the same school in the previous year. For this group, there had been no pretest, but they were administered the GMRT in Spring 1969 to ascertain their status and to provide a pretested population for further study.

The data collected at each school provided us with an average (of the word knowledge and reading) grade equivalent score for each child on the MAT and an average (of vocabulary and comprehension) grade equivalent score on the GMRT. Mean grade equivalent scores for the stable population in each school were computed, as were mean grade equivalent scores for the stable populations in all five schools.

In reviewing the data which follow, note should be taken that the grade equivalent score is based upon the premise that one-tenth of a grade of growth occurs during each school month. Since testing was not necessarily done exactly one school year (ten months) apart, differences are based upon norms assigned to each school month and are calculated upon this basis.

Also, while a number of pupils were tested in grade 1 with the GMRT, and later in grade 2 with both the GMRT and the MAT, it was considered appropriate to use the GMRT as the basis for pretest and posttest comparison for the sake of reliability. The MAT scores are, of course, related to schoolwide and citywide data, offering another basis for consideration of the effects of the program.

Similarly, a number of pupils were tested in grades 2 and 3 with the MAT and in grade 2 with the GMRT. For the purposes of this study, the data of the MAT administrations provide reliable information.

1. Reading Achievement: Five Special Schools - Second Grades, Spring 1969

a. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests

Second grade pupils were tested in May 1969 and in February 1968 (as first graders) with the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. In February 1968, the grade equivalent norm was 1.5. Thus, with a range of 1.4 to 1.9 on the GMRT, all tested first graders in the five schools were close to that norm or above it shortly after the initiation of the Special Primary Program.

Table V-1 shows the grade 2 stable population and the grade equivalent scores (GMRT) for the pre- and posttests for this group. Also given are the mean grade equivalent scores for the nonstable groups in the five schools and the grade equivalent scores obtained in the Spring 1969 Metropolitan Achievement Test in Reading.

TABLE V-1

MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES (READING) FOR SECOND GRADE POPULATIONS (STABLE[a] AND NONSTABLE) GATES-MACGINITIE PRETEST (SPRING 1968), POSTTEST (SPRING 1969) DATA AND METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (SPRING 1969) DATA FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS

SCHOOL		GMRT N	GMRT 2/68	NORM DEVIATION	GMRT 5/69	DIFF.	NORM DEVIATION	MAT N	MAT 3/69	NORM DEVIATION
A	Stable Group	125	1.5	0	1.9	+ .4	- .9	112	2.9	+ .3
	Nonstable Group							136	2.7	+ .1
B	Stable Group	75	1.9	+ .4	2.2	+ .3	- .6	73	2.4	- .2
	Nonstable Group							88	2.2	- .4
C	Stable Group	77	1.9	+ .4	2.7	+ .8	- .1	70	3.0	+ .4
	Nonstable Group							88	2.5	- .1
D	Stable Group	66	1.4	- .1	2.0	+ .6	- .8	59	2.2	- .4
	Nonstable Group							35	1.9	- .7
E	Stable Group	52	1.5	0	2.1	+ .6	- .7	46	2.4	- .2
	Nonstable Group							50	2.3	- .3
	Mean 5 Schools Stable Group	395	1.6	+ .1	2.1	+ .5	- .7	360	2.6	0
	Mean 5 Schools Nonstable Group							394	2.2	- .4
	Citywide Mean								2.8	+ .2
	Grade Equiv. (Norm)		1.5		2.8	+ 1.3			2.6	

[a] This group was identified as having been in the school and tested as first graders in 2/68 with GMRT.

Ordinarily, we would say that the next test date for this group, May 1969, followed one year and three months of schooling. Special circumstances occurred, however, which included a teachers' strike in most schools and generalized turmoil in communities throughout the city. With the loss of about two months in many schools, and the tension and distraction in almost every school, the effectiveness of educational programs remains in doubt. Even though four out of the five Special Primary Program schools remained open, these considerations should be kept in mind in terms of "months" between tests or "months" gained or lost.

The five schools showed changes in grade equivalent scores ranging from four months to eight months. This, with an expected normal forward movement of one year and three months.

The actual gains made were poor. In Spring 1968 in each school, first graders had been at the norm in schools A and E, one month below norm in school D, and four months above norm in schools B and C. One year later the same children averaged, in the five schools, seven months below the norm.

b. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading)

For the same stable population (with a few absentees noted), the MAT grade equivalent scores are not related to a pretest. They are all above the GMRT scores obtained two months later. While it is not the purpose of this study to "test the tests," this effect may call for further analysis and consideration.

Since all the pupils in second grade were tested with MAT in Spring 1969, a further comparison with the stable population shows that the difference between the two groups is in favor of the stable population.

In all schools, the nonstable group showed a relatively poorer status than the group that had been "in residence." It should be noted that the nonstable group included children who were likely to be transient but who at the time of the Spring 1969 MAT testing were in the school.

Thus, to compare the two groups on the basis of MAT results tends to show greater value of effects of the program for the stable population. We consider that there is a positive relationship between stability of a group of students and achievement of these students.

Acceptance of this view for the second grade group, however, is not reasonable in the light of their pre- and posttest scores on GMRT. Since there are no comparable GMRT scores for the total school populations at grades 1 and 2, the evidence for the Special Primary Program on the basis of present second grade GMRT scores is not so optimistic.

2. Reading Achievement - Five Special Schools - Third Grades, Spring 1969

Third grade pupils were tested in April 1968 (as second graders) and most recently in March 1969 with the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Reading. Table V-2 presents the data for this group and shows the test results as well for the nonstable population at the grade. For the stable population, in all five schools, the pretest average grade equivalent was 2.4, exactly equivalent to that of the nonstable grade 2 enrollment in those schools.

Although both groups as a whole show an average pretest grade equivalent of 2.4, this was three months below the test norm and four months below the citywide average for grade 2 in Spring 1968.

On posttesting, the stable population achieved two months more (3.6) than did the nonstable third grade group (3.4) in the five schools, while the citywide third graders' score was 3.6 and the test norm was 3.7.

Of the five schools, all stable groups but one began at the test norm (2.7) or below it, with a range of 2.1 to 3.2. The nonstable groups, present in the schools for the Spring 1968 testing, showed a comparable status. In school D the latter group scored higher than the group which was still in the school one year later.

After one year, with an expected forward movement of one year, all the stable groups but one made gains which brought two up to the expected norm (schools A and B), school C actually lost nine months from having been five months above norm to four months below it. In schools D and E, after one year the stable groups made slight gains and remained below the grade norm.

At the Spring 1969 testing, the nonstable groups, with varying amounts of time in the SPP, in all schools but one showed their achievement status to be close to that of the stable groups. In school A they were two months above the stable group and above the norm. In school E they were one year below the norm.

We might find some cause for optimism in that two of the schools show achievement at norm for the stable groups. The net gains, however, are so small over the period of one year (and the experience of these groups in the remaining schools relatively poor), that we cannot credit the SPP with achievement results for these pupils. It is more likely that individual school differences (as discussed earlier) may have produced the varying effects we have observed.

TABLE V-2

MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES (READING) FOR THIRD GRADE STABLE[a] AND NONSTABLE GROUPS METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST PRETEST (SPRING 1968), POSTTEST (SPRING 1969) DATA FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS

SCHOOL		N	MAT 4/68	NORM DEVIATION	MAT 4/69	DIFF.	NORM DEVIATION
A	Stable Group	108	2.1	- .6	3.7	+ 1.6	0
	Nonstable Group	167	1.9	- .8	3.9		+ .2
B	Stable Group	106	2.4	- .3	3.7	+ 1.3	0
	Nonstable Group	81	1.9	- .8	3.5		- .2
C	Stable Group	69	3.2	+ .5	3.3	+ .1	- .4
	Nonstable Group	60	2.6	- .1	3.1		- .6
D	Stable Group	53	2.4	- .3	3.6	+ 1.2	- .1
	Nonstable Group	37	3.1	+ .4	3.6		- .1
E	Stable Group	39	2.3	- .4	3.3	+ 1.0	- .3
	Nonstable Group	23	1.7	- 1.0	2.7		- 1.0
	Mean 5 Schools Stable Group	375	2.4	- .3	3.6	+ 1.2	- .1
	Mean 5 Schools Nonstable Group	368	2.4	- .3	3.4		- .3
	Citywide Mean		2.8	+ .1	3.6	+ .8	- .1
	Grade Equiv. (Norm)		2.7		3.7	+ 1.0	

[a] This group was identified as having been in the schools and tested as second graders in 4/68 with MAT.

3. Reading Achievement: Five Special Schools

Since there was no pretest-posttest condition for the first grade pupils in the five schools, it was decided to administer the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test to all enrolled. A selection was then made of the group in grade 1 that had been enrolled in the school in kindergarten the year before, at least during the Spring term. This, in effect, would represent a stable population in terms of enrollment.

With a test norm or grade equivalent of 1.8 for this group, the range of averages was from 1.7 to 3.5. The mean for the total stable group was 2.4.

Table V-3 presents the data for the 1968-69 first graders, stable population, and includes data for the nonstable group tested in that grade. We must add the cautionary note also that in numerous instances tests are not administered to pupils who lack adequate knowledge of English, to absentees, or to those who, in the judgment of teachers, are not prepared for the testing procedure.

Examination of the scores of all pupils tested shows that the stable group exceeded the nonstable group in all but one school. The differences between the two groups range from two months to one year and three months. In all cases the stable groups are above the norm, with school D one month below it.

We have noted earlier the tendency of the GMRT to yield somewhat lower grade equivalent scores for the same group than the MAT. If this is a generalized tendency, the stable group described in Table V-3 may obtain interesting (higher) scores when tested in Spring 1970 with the MAT.

Further longitudinal evaluation of this stable group should be carried out to provide more substantive data about their progress within the Special Primary Program when it is recycled.

Summary

We have referred to the probable axiom that the stability of a school population is positively related to its achievement as tested with standardized instruments.

In the Special Primary Program, it is most probably best reflected in the achievement potential shown by the first grade stable group in 1968-69. It seems much less true for the third graders (MAT pretest and posttest) and still less so for the second graders (GMRT pretest and posttest).

It is conceivable that the apparent slight success of the first grade group is due to several factors:

1. Their presence in the program as kindergarteners. This would represent nearly two years of schooling under the special teacher-pupil ratio, with the increased use over the period of paraprofessionals, with greater service each year by coordinators for curriculum and family contacts, and with the increasing awareness of teachers and community that the program is special and is actually in operation.

However, we have noted the possibility of such experience having been eroded following the summer period and the time of the teachers' strike.

2. The first grade group's comparative "youth," chronologically and in terms of school experience. That is, the other groups have experienced a variety of situations over two- and three-year periods so as to affect their progress. Thus, in some second graders' first year experience there may have been smaller classes, but not necessarily. For the 1967-68 kindergarteners, this was a general condition. Other aspects less favorable to the older children may include the lesser availability and use of paraprofessionals and the lesser experience of the school personnel themselves with the potential of their roles and activities in the Special Primary Program. The factors of increased teacher experience in working with smaller groups, of the growing effectiveness of paraprofessionals, and of the expansion of coordinator services in the school and the community cannot be overlooked. The values of practice and experience may be cumulative in accomplishing the objectives of the Special Primary Program.

If these factors are indeed operative, then the elements of the Special Primary Program are increasingly effective and should result in better academic achievement for the coming first graders (presently in kindergarten), and for the 1968-69 first grade stable population when it is tested in Spring 1970.

Further confirmation of program effectiveness should be looked for when those pupils now in the prekindergarten classes can be studied as stable kindergarteners and later as stable first grade pupils.

Since there is little evidence of the Special Primary Program's implementation in grades 4, 5, and 6, further study of the program at these grade levels depends upon the continual progress of the stable populations already identified and upon the implementation of program features in these higher grades.

TABLE V-3

MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES (READING) FOR FIRST GRADE STABLE[a] AND NONSTABLE GROUPS, GATES-MACGINITIE READING TEST (SPRING 1969) FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS

SCHOOL		GMRT N	GMRT 5/69	NORM DEVIATION
A	Stable Group	87	2.5	+ .7
	Nonstable Group	91	2.1	+ .3
B	Stable Group	77	3.5	+ 1.7
	Nonstable Group	68	2.2	+ .4
C	Stable Group	87	1.9	+ .1
	Nonstable Group	67	1.9	+ .1
D	Stable Group	58	1.7	- .1
	Nonstable Group	42	1.5	- .3
E	Stable Group	47	1.9	+ .1
	Nonstable Group	37	1.3	- .5
	Mean 5 Schools Stable Group	356	2.4	+ .6
	Mean 5 Schools Nonstable Group	305	1.8	0
	Grade Equiv. (Norm)		1.8	

[a] This group was identified as having been in the schools as kindergarten pupils in 1967-68.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Special Primary Program has completed a second cycle, and a second evaluation of the program has been undertaken.

Before turning to a consideration of recommendations, it must be emphasized that the Special Primary Program, as described in the project proposal, was never fully implemented in the five schools during the second cycle. Instead of the proposed smaller class size, and the resultant reduced teacher-pupil ratio, educational assistants were introduced into classrooms with larger registers, with a resultant reduced adult-pupil ratio -- a conceptual modification. Instead of increased psychological services, there were reduced services -- a modification imposed by the limits of accessibility. Instead of a large increase of faculty over a base of seven in the After School Study Center, the base was removed leaving almost twice as much personnel as existed in neighboring schools, but only about two-thirds of what the SPP schools expected.

What was evaluated in this paper, then, was not the SPP as originally envisaged in the request for funding, but a modified SPP with a smaller staff and larger classes. To what degree was this highly modified program successful? If one places major emphasis upon gains in achievement as an indication of program success, there was little evidence of growth in reading on the part of those pupils who were in the program for the period of two years. One wonders, however, to what extent growth in reading could have been expected in the light of the strike that closed the schools for so long a period at the beginning of the school year, in addition to the maintenance of registers at a high level, and the failure to provide sufficient additional personnel in the ASSC.

On the other hand, if one considers the attitudes of parents and teachers to be important factors in program evaluations, it is evident, although academic achievement showed little improvement, that parents and teachers looked upon even the modified SPP with approval. Among those aspects of the program that were singled out for special mention were the provisions for paraprofessional help in the classroom, the opportunities that were given to participate in an extended school day program, and the provision of specialized service personnel.

Because of the removal of the "base" positions in the After School Study Center, and of the lack of true reduction in class size in the day schools, it would appear that the right hand of the Board of Education gave what its left hand took away, if not entirely then in large sections, creating an only slightly "Special" Primary Program.

Recommendation for the recycling of the Special Primary Program is predicated upon the restitution into the proposal of its original components: reduced class size not only in grades pre-K and K, but also in grades 1 and 2; additional, not reduced, psychological services; increase in the ASSC faculty to the numbers originally intended.

The following recommendations, growing out of the present evaluation, based upon renewed and extended observations, additional interviews, and achievement test data for a stable pupil population, are offered for consideration:

1. Greater attention should be given to defining the tasks and responsibilities of the additional specialized personnel that is provided for in the program. Care should be taken that such personnel are not called upon to function in capacities other than those to which they should be assigned by virtue of the area of their speciality.

2. Improved procedures and techniques should be established for the articulation of ASSC programs and regular day school programs, particularly as they affect individual pupils.

3. Greater stress should be placed on development of parent involvement in the program by devising ways of activizing the inactive.

4. More frequent opportunities should be provided for principals and other personnel of the Special Primary Programs to meet so as to promote useful interchange of aims, practices, and programs.

5. All personnel, including principals and other administrators, should be oriented to the optimum use of the services of specialized staff and of paraprofessionals. Specialized personnel, following role clarification, should receive additional in-service training in improving effectiveness. On-the-job training for both teachers and paraprofessionals should be made an integral part of the program.

APPENDIX A

CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY

The following material, while not developed enough to be included in the text, is incorporated in the appendix in the hope that the instrument will be refined. The findings, in such an eventuality, should prove helpful to researchers.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY

The Special Primary Program places major emphasis on academic achievement as a goal. Such achievement may be seen in classroom reading skill progress, in the accumulation of standardized grade equivalent scores, and in early observation of the development of communication and social skills and of maturity in general.

Previous experience with the New York Child Development Scales by Jenkins and Phillips[1] had not proven satisfactory. We considered it important, however, to attempt to detect the early indications of reading-communication skills and of general maturity.

For this purpose, a nonstandardized instrument was formulated which consists of thirty statements, each indicative of a skill usually found among children in the kindergarten age group. Four additional summary statements were presented for teacher appraisal: personal independence, language, interpersonal relations, and motor development.

Teachers were asked to indicate the child's ability or development in comparison with that of other children of his own age: markedly above average (score 4), above average (score 3), average (score 2), below average (score 1), markedly below average (score 0).

Seven children in each kindergarten class were selected at random and their appraisal was requested of the teachers of those classes. It was also determined (when possible) whether the child had: attended a prekindergarten in his present school; attended a prekindergarten in another school; attended no school before kindergarten.

Table A-1 presents the findings from the use of the instrument to determine whether there is a varying appraisal by teachers of children with different school experiences. As can be seen, as regards the children who had pre-K experience in the same (SPP) school, the means for the general development of such children were at the average (2) level in all the schools but one, where the girls were rated below average. In all the schools but one, boys with such experience were rated as somewhat more mature than the girls. The relatively small N tends to make this quite inconclusive.

---

[1] William O. Jenkins and Edna M. Phillips. Special Primary Program in Five Schools, p 20 (New York: Center for Urban Education. October 1968).

TABLE A-1

CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY IN KINDERGARTEN
FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS
MEAN RATINGS - Items 1 - 30 (General Development) Total N = 236

School				Pre-K in Other School	Pre-K in This School	No Pre-K
A	Boys	N	31	0	8	23
		Mean			2.1	1.9
	Girls	N	29	1	10	18
		Mean		2.0	2.0	2.0
	Total	N	60	1	18	41
		Mean		2.0	2.1	2.0
B	Boys	N	27	4	1	19
		Mean		1.8	2.7	2.1
	Girls	N	27	0	8	19
		Mean			2.1	2.0
	Total	N	54	4	12	38
		Mean		1.8	2.4	2.1
C	Boys	N	38	1	17	20
		Mean		2.6	2.0	2.1
	Girls	N	32	0	10	22
		Mean			2.5	2.4
	Total	N	70	1	27	42
		Mean		2.6	2.3	2.3
D	Boys	N	11	2	5	4
		Mean		3.2	2.5	2.9
	Girls	N	14	1	3	10
		Mean		4.0	2.1	2.6
	Total	N	25	3	8	14
		Mean		3.6	2.3	2.8
E	Boys	N	12	1	4	7
		Mean		1.9	2.1	1.8
	Girls	N	15	1	7	7
		Mean		2.0	1.7	2.3
	Total	N	27	2	11	14
		Mean		2.0	1.9	2.1

In three of the schools, the boys with pre-K experience were seen by their teachers as somewhat more mature than those who had no pre-K experience. While this may appear to be a logical circumstance, the mean ratings for girls with pre-K experience are in their favor by one tenth of a rating step in two schools, exactly the same in one school, and in two schools show greater maturity for those girls who had no pre-K experience.

Thus we determine that the data for general development as shown in Table A-1 may be inconclusive because of the inadequacy of the instrument, the small N, or the lack of teacher preparation in the use of the instrument.

We prefer to anticipate further development and testing of the instrument with an emphasis upon the improvement of its use by the appraising teachers.

Table A-2 presents the combined ratings of teachers for the four summary traits: personal independence, language, interpersonal relations, and motor development. These are summaries, in four categories, of the first thirty items. They enable the teacher to generalize in each area after she has indicated her judgment on the individual items for the child. We combined them to obtain an averaging of the four generalized ratings into an overall rating.

On these items also, there seems to be no clear pattern of teacher response to child development: boys without pre-K experience were seen as more mature in three schools than those who had pre-K in this school. Girls, on the other hand, were rated higher with pre-K experience than those without in four of the schools. Also, girls with pre-K experience were generally seen as more mature than boys with the same experience. This finding tends to conform with the frequently-stated concept that girls may mature more rapidly than boys of the same chronological age. However, since the data vary so much from school to school, and since it was not feasible to use outside observers to evaluate child development reliably in the five schools, the results do not provide a reason to generalize with regard to the SPP.

Table A-3 presents the appraisal of kindergarten children in terms of single summary factor: language development. There is a general indication that children are seen as more mature or more capable with the pre-K experience. Further, highest mean ratings (ranging from 2.5 to 3.0) have been given to boys with pre-K experience. In school D, the highest rating (2.8) is given to boys without pre-K experience.

Allowing for the small N, it may be possible to generalize that teachers, when asked to focus specifically on language development, will tend to give higher ratings to boys with pre-K experience, and to boys in general. Further studies with the instrument and its additional refinement, as well as the development of greater reliability for raters may provide more useful information than we now have.

TABLE A-2

CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY IN KINDERGARTEN
FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS
MEAN RATINGS - Items 31-34 (Summary)
Total N = 236

School				Pre-K in Other School	Pre-K in This School	No Pre-K
A	Boys	N	31	0	8	23
		Mean			2.1	2.6
	Girls	N	29	1	10	18
		Mean		2.0	2.2	2.0
	Total	N	60	1	18	41
		Mean		2.0	2.2	2.3
B	Boys	N	27	4	4	19
		Mean		2.1	2.8	2.1
	Girls	N	27	0	8	19
		Mean			2.9	2.0
	Total	N	54	4	12	38
		Mean		2.1	2.9	2.1
C	Boys	N	38	1	17	20
		Mean		2.5	2.2	2.3
	Girls	N	32	0	10	22
		Mean			2.7	2.3
	Total	N	70	1	27	42
		Mean		2.5	2.5	2.3
D	Boys	N	11	2	5	4
		Mean		3.1	2.3	3.0
	Girls	N	14	1	3	10
		Mean		4.0	2.7	2.5
	Total	N	25	3	8	14
		Mean		3.6	2.5	2.8
E	Boys	N	12	1	4	7
		Mean		2.0	2.9	2.2
	Girls	N	15	1	7	7
		Mean		2.0	1.9	2.4
	Total	N	27	2	11	14
		Mean		2.0	2.4	2.3

TABLE A-3

CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY IN KINDERGARTEN FIVE SPECIAL PRIMARY PROGRAM SCHOOLS MEAN RATINGS - Item 32 (Language Development) Total N = 236

School			Pre-K in Other School	Pre-K in This School	No Pre-K
A	Boys N	31	0	8	23
	Mean			2.5	1.7
	Girls N	29	1	10	18
	Mean		2.0	2.1	1.8
	Total N	60	1	18	41
	Mean		2.0	2.3	1.8
B	Boys N	27	4	4	19
	Mean		2.0	3.3	2.0
	Girls N	27	0	8	19
	Mean			3.0	1.9
	Total N	54	4	12	38
	Mean		2.0	3.2	2.0
C	Boys N	38	1	17	20
	Mean		2.0	2.0	2.2
	Girls N	32	0	10	22
	Mean			2.4	2.3
	Total N	70	1	27	42
	Mean			2.2	2.3
D	Boys N	11	2	5	4
	Mean		2.0	2.6	2.8
	Girls N	14	1	3	10
	Mean		4.0	2.5	2.5
	Total N	25	3	8	14
	Mean		3.0	2.6	2.7
E	Boys N	12	1	4	7
	Mean		3.0	2.5	1.4
	Girls N	15	1	7	7
	Mean		2.0	1.6	2.4
	Total N	27	2	11	14
	Mean		2.5	2.1	1.9

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

Page

Principals Interview Guide B1

Child Development Study - Kindergarten B4

Parent Interview Guide B6

Pupil Interview Guide B8

Questionnaire for Teachers on Special Assignments B10

Teacher Questionnaire B12

After School Study Center Observation Guide B14

After School Study Center Survey B16

Individual Lesson Observation Report B18

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

PRINCIPALS INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. How much staff was allotted? How much did the school receive?

2. What other special programs exist in the school?

3. The technical set-up

   a) In what grades does the program put greatest emphasis?

   b) How many classes are there in each grade? How large are the classes?

      Pre K
      K
      1
      2
      3
      4
      5
      6

   c) What is the register of the school? How mobile is its population?

   d) What is the ethnic composition?

      Negro - Puerto Rican - Other -

4. Staff

   a) How many teachers and/or paraprofessionals are there per class? How do they function?

      As Cluster Teachers Team Teachers Subject Specialists As Aides

   b) How many school aides, teacher aides, or other paraprofessionals?

      What is their function?

c) How was the additional staff selected? What provision has been made for their special training?

1) Assistant Principal
2) Grade Coordinator
3) Administrator and Secretary
4) Teachers
5) Aides
6) Guidance Counselor
7) Language Enrichment Teacher
8) Community Relations Teacher
9) Teacher-Grades 3 & 4 (Coordinator)
10) Teacher-Speech Improvement

5. Grade Coordinators

a) How many are there? For which grades?

b) What proportion of their time is devoted to

1) teaching?
2) planning and coordinating instructional and other materials?
3) conducting meetings? (What kind of meetings?)
4) training teachers?
5) maintaining liaison with other grades?

6. Guidance counselor

a) How does he function

1) with the maladjusted child?
2) with the faculty?
3) with the community?

7. Clinical team psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker

a) Does the school have its quota?
b) How much time per week does each give to the Special Primary Program ?
c) What special use is being made ofthese increased services?

8. The Community Relations Counselor

a) What is his role?
b) How successful has he been thus far?

9. Involvement of Parents

   a) How frequently are parents' meetings held?
      How many attend?
   b) How do parents aid in the reading program?
   c) Are they used in any volunteer capacity?
   d) Are there parent workshops organized in the school? On what subjects?
   e) Are there other parent activities?

10. What is the nature of the school's involvement with the community?

11. In the Special Primary Program what constitutes cultural enrichment?

12. After School Study Center

   a) How many children are in attendance? Is attendance voluntary?
   b) How many teachers should there be? How many are there?
   c) How effective is the remedial program?

13. What would you consider to be the strengths of the Special Primary Program?

14. Have there been any special measures taken to inform teachers, parents or the public about this special program in your school?

15. Are there any specific suggestions from the staff or the administration?

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY - KINDERGARTEN

To the teacher:

We would like your help in studying the development of kindergarten children in the Special Primary Program. For this purpose we are making a random selection of the children in your group and would like you to give the following information about each one:

Name of child: ______________________________

Boy ____ Girl ____ Date of Birth ____________________

School ________ Class _______________ Teacher ____________

Check one:

___This child has attended a Pre-Kindergarten in this school.

___This child has attended a Pre-Kindergarten in another school.

___This child has not attended school before Kindergarten.

For all the remaining items, please write a letter on the line in front of the item, using the following scale:

A. Markedly above average.
B. Above average
C. Average
D. Below average
E. Markedly below average.

Rate the particular ability or characteristic of this child in comparison with other children of his own age.

1. ____ Ability to dress himself (coat, buttons, rubbers, etc.).

2. ____ Knows his name, address, etc.

3. ____ Takes care of toilet needs independently.

4. ____ Takes responsibility for organizing materials, cleaning up, other housekeeping tasks.

5. ____ Works consistently and persists toward finishing.

6. ____ Evaluates his own behavior and his work realistically.

7. ____ Makes adequate use of adult guidance.

8. ____ Works in organized group and shares materials.

(turn to next page)

9. _____ Uses verbal communication to request and inform.

10. _____ Plays cooperatively, interacts with group of two to five children.

11. _____ Helps other children in classroom routines.

12. _____ Re-enacts roles of adults in family, community, or stories.

13. _____ Shows interest and motivation for books, other printed material.

14. _____ Expresses anger verbally, rather than physically.

15. _____ Speaks in short sentences.

16. _____ Relates incidents in sequential form.

17. _____ Takes initiative in speaking to other children.

18. _____ Takes initiative in speaking with adults.

19. _____ Speaks all sounds clearly.

20. _____ Recognizes and names common colors correctly.

21. _____ Engages in sustained conversation appropriately.

22. _____ Uses words of several syllables (e.g., elevator, apologize).

23. _____ Adapts his speech and language to fit roles of others in dramatization.

24. _____ Runs, skips, gallops in time to music.

25. _____ Carries cup of water without spilling.

26. _____ Places blocks in simple arrangements.

27. _____ Uses hammer, scissors satisfactorily.

28. _____ Holds pencil, crayon in adequate manner.

29. _____ Throws ball overhand with proper body movement.

30. _____ Ties shoelaces with firm knot and bow.

In general, what is your appraisal of this child in terms of:

31. _____ personal independence

32. _____ language

33. _____ interpersonal relations

34. _____ motor development.

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

PARENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

School:________________________

How long in this school?________

1. Do you work in the school in any capacity -- as an aide, or cafeteria worker -- for a salary? Yes:____; No:____

2. Have you volunteered your services to the school at least once?

   Yes:____; No:____

3. How many of your children go to this school at the present time?______ What grades are they in? ____________

4. How many times during the term have you been in touch with your child's teacher or principal, either through letters sent home, or through personal contact? (Please check)

   Not at all:____; Once a month:____; Once a week:____; More than 15 times:____

5. Have you attended or do you attend a Parents' Workshop?

   Yes:____; On what subject?______________
   No: ____

6. Does your child attend the After School Study Center?

   Yes:____; No:____. If yes, what grade is he in? ____

7. If he does attend, do you feel that this has helped your child in his regular daytime studies? (Please check)

   Very much:____; A little:____; Not at all:____

8. Have you been asked to check, or do you check, his homework?

   Yes:____; No:____

9. Do you provide a regular time and place for hin to do his homework?

   Yes:____; No:____

10. About his homework: do you think he is given (please check)

    too much:____; too little:____ enough:____

11. Does your child read more at home this year than last year? Yes:___;No:___

12. Does he take books home from the school or class library? Yes:___;No:___

From the public library? Yes:___; No___

13. Have you been invited to any meetings which were planned to tell you what your child is being taught and how? Please give details:

____

____

____

14. Have you been able to help your child with his homework?

Yes:____; No____; Sometimes:_____

15. Have youbeen asked to find out what is being taught and how, so that you can help your child?

Yes:____; No:____

16. Do you think it is proper for a parent to be asked to help to teach his child?

Yes:____; No:____

17. Do you think all teaching (of reading, writing, arithmetic, etc.) should be left completely to the teacher?

Yes:____; No:____

18. Do you have any suggestions which you think might improve the running of the After School Study Center?

____

____

____

19. Do you have any suggestions which you think might improve the school's program in the lowest grades, pre-kindergarten through grade 3?

____

____

____

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

PUPIL INTERVIEW GUIDE (GRADES 2 AND 3)

Name of child:______________________________________ Date________

Boy:_____; Girl:_____ Date of Birth (Age):_______________

School:______________ Class:____________ Teacher:__________________________

1. Do you attend the After School Study Center? Yes:____; No:______

(If NO, go to Item 7)

2. How often do you go? Nearly every day:____; about four days a week:____;

About three days a week:_____; About two days a week:____;

About one day a week:_____

3. What do you like to do best at the Center? ____________________

____

4. What is the next best thing you like to do there?______________

____

5. What club (class) at the Center do you like least of all? ____________

____

Tell why:____

6. Do you have a reading club (class) at the Center? Yes:____; No:____

7. Do you take home books to read from the library in school or in your class? Yes:____; No:____

8. Do you take books from the public library? Yes:____ No:____

9. What kind of reader are you?

Very good:____; Fair:____; Not good:____

10. Are you a better reader this year than you were last year?

Yes:____; About the same:____; No, worse____

11. Do you have homework during the week? Yes:____; No:____

12. Does someone at home help you with your homework?

No:____; Yes:____ Who? Mother:_____ Father:____
Sister:_____ Brother:____
Other person (who?):________________________

13. Does someone from your family come to school some days?

No:____; Yes:____. Why? Talk to teacher:______

Talk to someone else (who?):__________

Work in the school:_______

Be at a meeting:__________

Other (tell):____________________

14. What is your favorite school subject?__________________

15. What school subject do you like least of all? __________________

16. Do you stay home from school sometimes?

Never:____; Once in a while:_____; A lot:_________

Why?

Sick:_____ Take care of younger child:_____

Go to store, do errands:______Help mother:________

Don't want to come some days:______

Other reason (what?):______________________________

17. How do you feel about school?

Like it very much:_____ It's all right:________

Not too well:_________ Not at all:___________

Reason:____

____

____

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS ON SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS

School ____________ **Name** ____________________

Years of experience __________ **In grades** ____________

Years in this school __________ **License held** ____________

Position title under SPP ______________________________

1. **How long have you held this special assignment under the Special Primary Program? One year _____ Two years ______**

2. **Did you have any special professional, academic, or other qualifications for this position? Please specify:**

   ____

   ____

3. **Are you required to attend any professional district or city meetings because of your assignment? Please specify type and frequency:** ______________________

4. **Do you have any other school duties outside the area of your special assignment? Describe:** ______________________

   ____

5. **Describe the nature of your duties. What proportion of your weekly time do you spend on each?**

   a) ____________________________________ % ________

   b) ____________________________________ % ________

   c) ____________________________________ % ________

   d) ____________________________________ % ________

   e) ____________________________________ % ________

6. **What proportion and amount of your weekly time do you devote to contacts with people?**

   a) other teachers Number of contacts ___ % ___ Grades ___

   b) pupils Number of contacts ___ % ___ Grades ___

   c) parents Number of contacts ___ % ___ Grades ___

   d) others Number of contacts ___ % ___ Define ___

7. **Other than reduced class size, what have you observed this year about the following aspects of the Special Primary Program (Pre-K through 3rd)? (Please comment.)**

   Curriculum enrichment: ___

   Pupil creativity: ___

   Parent involvement: ___

   Pupil growth (subject areas or abilities): ___

8. **Are there any comments you wish to make about the Special Primary Program? ___**

9. **Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the SPP?**

B12

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

School:______________________

To the teacher:

We should like to enlist your aid in evaluating the extent to which the After School Study Center and the Special Primary Program are helping the individual children in your class. We would appreciate your answering the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Your replies will be held in complete confidence.

1. How many children are registered in your class? ________
2. How many children in your class attend the ASSC? ________

For those children who attend the ASSC:
Please answer the following questions by comparison with last year.

a. About how many are now more actively seeking books in the classroom or outside of school than last year? ________

b. About how many are now more actively participating in reading and related activities? ________

c. About how many are showing reading improvement this year in terms of

phonics ____

comprehension ____

study skills ____

d. About how many have shown improved relationships with their peers over last year? ________

e. About how many have shown improved relationships with teachers over last year? ________

f. About how many have shown improvement over last year in carrying out assignments either in or outside of school? ________

g. About how many have shown any evidence of finding new interests this year as a result of attending ASSC (e.g., in science, or in art)? ________

h. Have you noticed any attitudinal changes since last year? Please describe:______________________________

____

____

____

i. About how many have shown improvement over last year in their attendance, or promptness, at school? ________

j. Do you have any suggestions as to how the ASSC might better improve the child's work during the day? ________________

____

____

____

3. What grade do you now teach? ________

4. How many years of experience have you had in primary school education (including this year)? ________

5. How many years of experience have you had in teaching disadvantaged children? ________

6. How many years of teaching have you had in this school?________

7. Have you been able to find new techniques this year for handling your class in small groups? Yes:___; No:___

8. If so, please describe one of them briefly. ________________

____

9. Has there been greater parent involvement and interest in the children's progress this year? Yes:____; No:____

10. Is the presence of another teacher in your classroom a hindrance? Yes:____; No:____

11. Would you rather conduct a class of 15 or 20 by yourself? Yes:____; No:____

12. Does the supervision you receive encompass so much that it interferes with your creativity? Yes:____; No:____

13. Would you welcome further training in the teaching of the disadvantaged? Yes:____; No:____.

14. What training do you think would be helpful to you in your teaching? Or what specific help would you like to have?________________

____

____

15. Do you have any other general comments or suggestions about the Special Primary Program?________________

____

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTER OBSERVATION GUIDE

School: ______________ **Date:** ____________ **Teacher:** __________

Auxiliary help present: ____

1. How many were registered? (Pre-K -2): ________ **(3-6):** ________

2. How many were present? (Pre-K -2): ________ **(3-6):** ________

3. Activities observed: ____

____

4. How were these activities carried out:

- **a. as regular classroom lessons?** ___________
- **b. in the form of games?** ___________
- **c. in the form of projects?** ___________
- **d. through individual tutoring?** ___________
- **e. other procedures?** ________________________________

____

5. Did the children seem to feel:

- **a. that there was pressure on them to learn?** ________
- **b. that they were there just to relax and enjoy?** ________
- **c. unwilling to do either?** ________

6. Were there enough materials available different from day school?

Yes: ___; No: ___

7. Did the teacher show ingenuity or initiative in creating materials or a variety of activities for the class?

Yes: ___; No: ___; Describe: ______________________________

____

8. Did the teacher show:

   a. enthusiasm, warmth, and competence? ____________

   b. competence in performance of duty? ____________

   c. ineptness? ____________

   Describe: ____

   d. other characteristics? __________________________________

   Describe: ____

9. Did the amount of subject matter covered warrant the additional time devoted to it?

   Yes: ____; No: _____

10 Did the observed evidence of pupil growth in other aspects (attitudes, neutralization of antisocial behavior, etc.) warrant the time spent?

   Yes: _____; No: ____

   Explain: ____

11. Was the teacher able to adapt to the smaller register (or attendance) so as to make maximum use of it?

   completely: ______

   in many or most instances: _______

   not at all: ________

B16

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTER SURVEY

School:_____________________________

1. What is the school register? ____________________________________

2. What is the ASSC register: Pre-K to 2:________

   3rd to 6th:________

3. Is attendance voluntary? Yes:____; No:______

4. How many actually attend? Pre-K to 2:________

   3rd to 6th:________

5. Is the ASSC program supervised by:

   a) The central Board of Education ____
   b) District superintendent's office ____
   c) School principal ____
   d) Teacher-in-charge ____
   e) Individual instructor ____

6. What is the content of the program?

   a) Remedial reading_____
   b) Remedial arithmetic____
   c) Other remedial subjects; describe:____________________________

   ____

   d) Cultural enrichment (describe activities)______________________

   ____

   ____

7. In what way is this ASSC different from last year's after school program?

   a) attendance ____
   b) enrichment ____
   c) general atmosphere____
   d) instruction ____
   e) additional materials ____
   f) Other; explain _______________

   ____

   ____

8. What provisions have been made by the school for testing the effectiveness of the ASSC program?

a) ASSC testing program ____
b) Day school testing ____
c) Parent questionnaire ____
d) Teacher questionnaire ____
e) Student questionnaire ____
f) Other; describe: ________

____

____

9. In what ways have parents been involved?

a) as volunteers ____
b) as paid aides or instructors ____
c) through observation of ASSC ____
d) through workshops____
e) through student progress reports ____
f) through other means; explain: ____________

____

____

Center for Urban Education

Special Primary Program

INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT

School____________Grade_____Class______Date_____No.in Class_____

Teacher's Name________________Sex____Observer___________________

Length of Class Observation___________Activities Observed____________

1. How would you describe the teacher's overall handling of the children's spontaneous questions?

   1. Questions were welcomed and built on.
   2. Questions were answered cursorily.
   3. Questions were ignored.
   4. Opportunity for spontaneous questions was there but few or none were asked. Why?____________________________
   8. Not relevant. Explain:

   ____

2. What was the overall participation of children?

   1. Every or almost every child was actively involved.
   2. More than half participated.
   3. About half participated.
   4. Fewer than half participated.
   5. Very few or none participated.
   8. Not relevant. Explain:______________________________

3. What was the children's general understanding of the teacher's spoken word?

   1. Every or almost every child understood fully.
   2. More than half understood.
   3. About half the children understood fully.
   4. Less than half the children understood.
   5. Very few or no children understood.

4. How would you describe the overall verbal fluency of the children who participated?
   1. Articulated clearly with correct grammar.
   2. Articulated clearly with some grammatical errors.
   3. Articulated clearly with many grammatical errors.
   4. Articulated indistinctly with correct grammar.
   5. Articulated indistinctly with some grammatical errors.
   6. Articulated indistinctly with many grammatical errors.
   8. Not relevant. Explain:______________________________

   ____

5. How would you describe the verbal communication among the children?

   1. Articulated clearly with correct grammar.
   2. Articulated clearly with some grammatical errors.
   3. Articulated clearly with many grammatical errors.
   4. Articulated indistinctly with correct grammar.
   5. Articulated indistinctly with some grammatical errors.
   6. Articulated indistinctly with many grammatical errors.
   8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________
   ____

6. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with the children?

   1. Always or almost always spoke to the children on their level of understanding.
   2. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding more than half the time.
   3. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding about half the time.
   4. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding less than half the time.
   5. Seldom or never spoke to the children on their level of understanding.

7. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with non-English-speaking children?

   1. Communicates with ease.
   2. Communicates with some difficulty.
   3. Communicates with great difficulty.
   8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

8. How would you describe the overall relationship among the children?

   1. All or almost all the children seem to get along well with others as a total class.
   2. All or almost all the children seem to get along well with some of the others with evidence of small social cliques.
   3. More than half the children seem to get along well with others.
   4. About half the children seem to get along well with others.
   5. Less than half the children seem to get along well with others.
   6. Very few or no children seem to get along well with others.

9. How would you describe the overall teacher-pupil relationship?

    1. Teacher seems to get along well with all or almost all the pupils.
    2. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, ignoring the rest.
    3. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, and shows an overt distaste for some.
    4. Teacher seems to get along well with about half the pupils.
    5. Teacher seems to get along well with less than half the pupils.
    6. Teacher seems to get along well with very few or none of the pupils.

10. How would you rate the overall quality of instruction?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

11. How would you rate the classroom's appearance?

    1. Extremely attractive
    2. Of greater than average attractiveness
    3. Average
    4. Less than average attractiveness
    5. Unattractive

    Additional observation____

    ____

12. How would you describe the classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?

    1. Undisciplined and warm.
    2. Undisciplined and cold.
    3. Disciplined yet congenial or warm
    4. Disciplined and cold.
    5. Overdisciplined yet warm.
    6. Overdisciplined and cold.

13. Who conducted this activity?

    1. Regular classroom teacher
    2. Cluster teacher
    3. Substitute teacher
    4. Special staff (indicate who)______________________________
    5. Other (indicate who)____________________________________

14. Approximate number of children in teaching unit __________

    a) If less than total class, what were others doing? __________

    ____

15. How typical do you think this activity was of normal classroom functioning?

    1. Completely typical
    2. Reasonable approximation
    3. Atypical. Explain: ______________________________

16. Amount of planning and organization evident in this activity?

    1. Exceptionally well organized and planned.
    2. Well organized and planned but not exceptionally so.
    3. Well organized and showed some evidence of planning.
    4. Not organized but showed some signs of previous teacher planning.
    5. Showed few or no signs of organization or planning.

17. Was concept development employed? Explain.

    1. Yes
    2. No

    Explain: ______________________________

    ____

18. Level of creativity and imagination evident in this activity?

    1. Extremely creative
    2. Predominantly creative
    3. Partly creative and partly stereotyped
    4. More stereotyped than creative
    5. Extremely stereotyped

19. If you rated the activity as "extremely" creative, or "predominantly" creative, please explain why.

    ____

    ____

20. Use of the children's background and experience evident in this activity?

    1. Consistent opportunities for children to relate activity to their own background.
    2. Consistent opportunities for children to bring experience to activity.
    3. Some opportunity for children to relate activity to their own background.
    4. Some opportunity for children to use experience in activity.
    5. Activity was remote from children's experience.
    8. Not relevant. Explain:____________________

21. To what extent and how effectively were teaching aids utilized?

    1. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively.
    2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively.
    3. Some used and used creatively and effectively.
    4. Some used but not particularly effectively.
    5. Little or no use of teaching aids.
    8. Not relevant. Explain:____________________

22. Amount of material covered?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor
    8. Not relevant. Explain:____________________

23. How would you rate the depth of instruction?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor
    8. Not relevant. Explain:____________________

24. How many children showed interest and enthusiasm?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. Half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Few or no children.
8. Not relevant. Explain:____________________________

25. How many children raised spontaneous questions?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. About half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Few or no children.

26. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. About half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Very few or no children.
8. Not relevant. Explain:____________________________

27. Had this activity been duplicated with a class size of 30-35, what would have happened to its effectiveness?

1. Larger class would have completely destroyed effectiveness.
2. Larger class size would have seriously impeded effectiveness.
3. Activity would have been somewhat less effective in a larger class.
4. There would have been no loss of effectiveness.

Additional Comments:

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX C

STAFF LIST

Nathan Kravetz, Evaluation Director
Associate Professor of Education
Herbert H. Lehman College
The City University of New York

Edna M. Phillips, Associate Director

Theodora Lacey, Interviewer

Julia Plapinger, Clerk